UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

BINDING LIST APR 1 1922.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY
SHANGHAI

MODERN PHILOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

EDITED BY
JOHN M. MANLY, *General Editor*
CHARLES R. BASKERVILL, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM A. NITZE · STARR W. CUTTING · TOM PEETE CROSS
KARL PIETSCH · FRANCIS A. WOOD · GEORGE W. SHERBURN
GEORGE T. NORTHUP · JAMES R. HULBERT · JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER
T. ATKINSON JENKINS · ERNEST H. WILKINS

ADVISORY BOARD
JAMES W. BRIGHT · GEORGE L. KITTREDGE
GEORGE HEMPL · FREDERICK M. WARREN
FREDERIC I. CARPENTER

171615
18.V.22

VOLUME EIGHTEEN
1920–1921

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

PB
1
M7
v.18

Published
May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December, 1920
January, February, March, April, 1921

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

CONTENTS

A. LeRoy Andrews. Studies in the Fornaldarsǫgur Norðrlanda . 93
Charles Read Baskervill. The Genesis of Spenser's Queen of Faerie 49
Jacob N. Beam. Hermann Kirchner's *Sapientia Solomonis* . . . 101
Arthur C. L. Brown. The Grail and the English *Sir Perceval* 201 and 661
W. F. Bryan. The Midland Present Plural Indicative Ending *-e(n)* . 457
Frederick A. G. Cowper. The New Manuscript of *Ille et Galeron* . 601
Tom Peete Cross. Alfred Tennyson as a Celticist 485
———. "The Psalter of the Pig," an Irish Legend 443
Starr Willard Cutting. Calvin Thomas, 1854–1919 . . . 119
———. A Hitherto Unpublished Poem by Friedrich von Schiller . 343
Mario Esposito. A Ninth-Century Astronomical Treatise . . 177
Edwin W. Fay. Professor Prokosch on the IE. Sonant Aspirates . 109
M. B. Finch and E. Allison Peers. Walpole's Relations with Voltaire. 189
R. S. Forsythe. A Plautine Source of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* . 401
Thornton S. Graves. Richard Rawlidge on London Playhouses . 41
———. Some Allusions to Richard Tarleton 493
James Holly Hanford. The Arrangement and Dates of Milton's Sonnets 475
George R. Havens. The Abbé Le Blanc and English Literature . 423
Harold N. Hillebrand. The Early History of the Chapel Royal . 233
A. R. Hohlfeld. Pact and Wager in Goethe's *Faust* 513
J. R. Hulbert. The Problems of Authorship and Date of *Wynnere and Wastoure* 31
John S. Kenyon. On the Date of *The Owl and the Nightingale* . . 55
W. Kurrelmeyer. Niflant, Iflant 557
H. Carrington Lancaster. La Calprenède Dramatist . 121 and 345
Samuel Moore. New Life-Records of Chaucer. Addendum . . 497
George Tyler Northup. Caballo de Ginebra 157
Alois Richard Nykl. Old Spanish *Girgonça* 597
K. Pietsch. The Madrid Manuscript of the Spanish Grail Fragments . . . . . 147 and 591
John D. Rea. Longfellow's "Nature" 48
———. A Note on *Romeo and Juliet*, II, i, 1–2 675
Edith Rickert. A New Interpretation of *The Parlement of Foules* . 1
F. Schoenemann. Friedrich Lienhards Literaturbetrachtung . . 545

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL. The Cave Scene in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* 537
MARTIN SCHÜTZE. The Fundamental Ideas in Herder's Thought . . . . . 65 and 289
J. E. SHAW. "And the Evening and the Morning Were One Day" . 569
E. S. SHELDON. Some *Roland* Emendations 143
JOHN S. P. TATLOCK. The Epilog of Chaucer's *Troilus* . . . 625
GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK. Corneille's Early Friends and Surroundings 361
HERMANN J. WEIGAND. Heine's Return to God 309
RALPH C. WILLIAMS. Epic Unity as Discussed by Sixteenth-Century Critics in Italy 383
STANLEY J. WILLIAMS. Some Versions of *Timon of Athens* on the Stage 269
FRANCIS A. WOOD. Germanic *w*-Gemination . . . . 79 and 303

REVIEWS AND NOTICES:

Allason: Caroline Schlegel, Studio sul Romanticismo Tedesco (T. P. Cross) 678
Aron: Traces of Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore (T. P. Cross) 679
Babbitt: Rosseau and Romanticism (E. Preston Dargan) . . 162
Bayfield: A Study of Shakespeare's Versification (John S. P. Tatlock) 504
Brown: A Register of Middle English Didactic and Religious Verse. Part II (J.M.M.) 287
Burnham, ed.: A Classical Technology (Charles H. Beeson) . 623
Carré: Goethe en Angleterre (T. P. Cross) 678
Cohen: Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle (T. P. Cross) 680
Crane: Italian Social Customs in the Sixteenth Century and Their Influence on the Literatures of Europe (William A. Nitze) . 609
Cross: The History of Henry Fielding (T. P. Cross) 677
Gollancz, ed.: A Good Short Debate between Winner and Waster (J. R. Hulbert) 499
Grandgent: Old and New, Sundry Papers (T. P. Cross) . . 231
Guérard: French Civilization from Its Origins to the Close of the Middle Ages (William A. Nitze) 609
Hayens: Theodor Fontane: A Critical Study (Harvey W. Thayer) 561
Hewitt: Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn Writer and His Influence on English Hymnody (T. P. Cross) 678
Hoare: A Short Italian Dictionary (Ernest H. Wilkins) . . 623
Jones: Lewis Theobald. His Contribution to English Scholarship (George Sherburn) 57

Leuvensche Bijdragen op het Gebied van de Germaansche Philologie en in 't bijzonder van de Nederlandsche Dialectkunde (T. P. Cross) 679
Moore: Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Middle English Grammar (J. R. H.) 63
Moore and Knott: The Elements of Old English (J. R. H.) . 63
Osgood, ed.: The Pearl (J. R. Hulbert) 499
Pinger: Laurence Sterne and Goethe (T. P. Cross) . . . 678
Recent Works on Phases of the English Renaissance (C. R. Baskervill) 505
Revue de Littérature Comparée (T. P. Cross) 680
Riddell: Flaubert and Maupassant: A Literary Relationship (George R. Havens) 617
Rodríguez y Marín, ed.: El Diablo Cojuelo, Luis Vélez de Guevara (E. R. Sims) 620
Rudwin: The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy (Louise Mallinckrodt Kueffner) 565
Schofield: Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace (T. P. Cross) 229
Simmons: Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation Prior to 1860 (O. W. Long) 677
Simons: Waltharius en de Walthersage (T. P. Cross) . . . 680
Weston: From Ritual to Romance (T. P. Cross) 679
Winkler: Französische Dichter des Mittelalters: II. Marie de France (Foster E. Guyer) 171
Wright: French Classicism (William A. Nitze) 609

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *May 1920* NUMBER 1

A NEW INTERPRETATION OF *THE PARLEMENT OF FOULES*

PRESENT STATUS OF THE PROBLEM

It is with proper diffidence that I venture upon a battlefield so hotly contested as the meaning of this poem. In 1877 Koch[1] introduced Anne of Bohemia as the "formel" and Richard II, William of Hainaut (Bavaria), and Frederick of Meissen as the three eagle-suitors. In 1910–11, Professor O. F. Emerson, with the assistance of Dr. Samuel Moore, threw out William of Hainaut (Bavaria), pushed Frederick of Meissen into second place, and introduced as a formidable rival of King Richard, his adversary of France,[2] Charles VI. This revised hypothesis, according to Dr. Moore, "rests upon grounds of proof that come little short of amounting to a demonstration."[3] But in 1913 Professor Manly[4] challenged the right of these historic figures to be in the poem at all, and after showing up the cracks in their armor, knocked them off their pedestals as unworthy to bear a part in its interpretation. In 1914 Professor Emerson[5] tried to set them up again, with a few more props. In 1916 Mr. Hugo

[1] *Englische Studien*, I, 287 ff., and *Essays on Chaucer* (Chaucer Society Publications), Part IV, pp. 400 ff.

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, VIII, 45 ff.; *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXVI, 8 ff., 109 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, XXVI, 12.

[4] *Stud. zur eng. Phil.*, Heft L, pp. 279 ff.

[5] *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XIII, 566 ff.

Lange[1] in a short paper argued further for the Koch-Emerson theory. In 1917 Mr. W. E. Farnham[2] entered the field, maintaining that while it might not be necessary to banish these historical personages altogether, as Professor Manly would do, they must be kept strictly in the background, as the poem could be interpreted perfectly well without them.

In 1918 Mr. Viktor Langhans[3] published an interpretation of the poem as an exposition of the nature of love, designed for St. Valentine's Day.

In this intensified polarity of opinion I venture to present a study of my own begun many years ago and left unfinished because of the inaccessibility of foreign libraries, and published now because it suggests a new line of investigation.

COMPARISON WITH *Il Paradiso degli Alberti*

In the first place, Giovanni da Prato's *Il Paradiso degli Alberti*, translated by Mr. Farnham, does not parallel or explain *The Parlement of Foules* in its lack of definite ending, as will be seen by detailed comparison:

PARLEMENT OF FOULES	PARADISO DEGLI ALBERTI[4]
There are three suitors, the first admittedly of higher rank and greater attractions.	There are four suitors of equal rank and merit.
All the characters are allegorized as birds, the leading persons as eagles.	All the characters are human except the heroine, who has been enchanted into a sparrow hawk.
The first suitor claims most ardent love, the second longest service, the third greatest faithfulness.	The first suitor sees the bird drowning and calls out, the second saves her, the third admires her beauty, cherishes her in his bosom, and says that she must be well cared for, and the fourth disenchants her.

[1] *Anglia*, XL, 395 ff. [2] *PMLA*, XXV, 492 ff.

[3] *Untersuchungen zu Chaucer*, pp. 19 ff.

[4] This is based upon Mr. Farnham's translation; I have not seen the original.

PARLEMENT OF FOULES	PARADISO DEGLI ALBERTI
To settle the argument, Nature, who presides over the parliament of birds assembled to choose mates, allows each class to appoint a spokesman to voice their opinion as to the merits of the three suitors.	To settle the dispute, an old peasant suggests that it be referred to Jove.
The tercelet of the falcon and Nature herself (who says that she speaks for Reason also) support the claim of the first eagle; the others are not supported.	Saturn, Mars, Apollo, and Mercury—each in turn argues for one of the four lovers; Venus and Minerva leave the choice to the girl.
The representatives of the three classes of common birds discuss what the first eagle shall do if the formel does not take him, and are unmercifully jeered at by the noble birds.	
The formel, although the plea of the first eagle has made her blush like a rose, refuses to decide, asks a year's "respit," and then her "choys al fre."	The heroine chooses at once, and the gods attend the wedding; but the audience is left to guess which suitor wins.

It is clear that the *Paradiso* is merely an example of the *demande d'amours*, the very point of which was to leave the ending unknown, so as to arouse discussion in the audience. Unquestionably Chaucer had in mind this literary type[1] in the central situation of *The Parlement of Foules*, but in no other *demande d'amours*, as far as I have been able to observe, has the balance of the argument been completely upset by throwing all the stress on the first suitor, and the problem shifted from Which will she choose? to Why does she not choose the first? And in no other *demande d'amours* is the love problem intertwined[2] as here with satire on the common birds, who do not agree with the "foules of ravyne" about the match but are willing that the first suitor should marry someone else. What will

[1] Cf. Manly, *loc. cit.*, pp. 283 ff.

[2] Cf. ll. 491–518 and 554–616.

explain this absolute twist of the poem from the type to which it belongs?

Such a variation might be due to artistic purpose; but no critic has attempted to explain the purpose here. Langhans indeed maintains that the general aim of the poem—to contrast pure love[1] with lawless love—shuts out the possibility of historical interpretation; but he does not touch upon the problem suggested above—the use of the *demande d'amours* with the balance of the argument entirely toward one of the suitors.

POLITICAL ALLEGORY AND COURT POETRY

The problem, then, reduces to this: If the type of source upon which the poem is based fails to explain this peculiarity, what grounds have we for supposing that the clue lies in a historical interpretation?

We have, for one thing, the common use of bird and beast allegory by Deschamps and Machaut. Deschamps expected the French court to understand his frequent allusions to prominent persons as birds or animals.[2]

Moreover, Deschamps wrote an elaborate bird allegory (*La Fiction de l'aigle*), satirizing the court of Charles VI, in which he represents the young king as an eagle, one of his uncles as a falcon, the nobility as the "gentle birds," the upstart courtiers as various kinds of common birds, and so on.[3]

Machaut in *Le Dit de l'alérion* (before 1350) uses bird allegory in a love poem, disguising four women as eagles and falcons.[4]

It was the fashion in court poetry of the fourteenth century, as may be illustrated abundantly from the works of Machaut,

[1] *Op. cit.*; from pp. 36 and 40 wedded love would be inferred.

[2] In accordance with fable lore, he uses both the eagle and the lion as symbols for different kings of France, especially Charles V and Charles VI. At other times he draws upon heraldry, as in referring to Richard II as the Leopard, and to Charles VI as the Wingéd Deer. And again he has in mind the famous allegorical prophecies in using the Heavy Ass (*l'âne pésant*) for Richard II, and the Wild Boar for the Black Prince.

In the use of the Fox for Charles the Bad of Navarre and of Tybert, the Cat, for John of Gaunt, the satirical intent is obvious.

For numerous political references in the form of animal allegory, see the Index to Deschamps (*Œuvres*, Société des Anciens Textes Français, Vol. X); and for the extensive use of birds and animals in political prophecy see Rupert Taylor's *The Political Prophecy in England*.

[3] *Op. cit.*, VI, 147 ff. The poem may be a little later than *The Parlement of Foules*, but it belongs to the beginning of Charles VI's reign.

[4] Ed. Hoepffner (Société des Anciens Textes Français), II, 239 ff.

Deschamps, Gower, and Chaucer himself, to refer to and discuss, directly and indirectly, political situations and personal affairs of princes.

Objections to the Richard-Anne Theory

Although Professor Manly has shown that the Richard-Anne theory is untenable, and has discussed the contradictions and absurdities involved in trying to date and motivate the poem on this basis, the later articles of Emerson[1] and Lange make further attack necessary.

In this paper I shall try to add to the argument that the Richard-Anne theory must be discarded by showing that (1) it does not explain Chaucer's divergence from the *demande d'amours* type or the inconclusive ending; (2) it does not explain the interweaving of satire—a bird House of Commons—with the love story; (3) it is not at present supported by historical evidence.

1. In the long history of the Richard-Anne theory[2] only two explanations have been offered for the formel's denial of the suitor favored by Nature, Reason, and herself. One is Emerson's suggestion of maiden coyness,[3] which is scarcely argument. The other is

[1] The chief new points introduced in Emerson's latest paper (*Jour. of Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, XIII) are the following: (1) He offers *The Book of the Duchess* as a parallel for the year's delay (pp. 570 f.). But surely "another year" need not mean "next year at the same time." The text says merely that after enduring his woe a long time the lover plucked up courage to try again at some later time. As Professor Emerson notes, the Duchess had refused him flatly, with no suggestion of asking for "respit." (2) He offers Dunbar's *The Thistle and the Rose* (*ibid.*, pp. 580 f.) as a parallel for the omission in the *Parlement* of all reference to the marriage. But why should we suppose that Dunbar, who wrote in May while the marriage arrangements were being made, should have waited until August to present his poem? Would he not have sent it at once in the season that suggested the form it took? Certainly no argument can be based upon the circumstances under which it was presented, as these are unknown. (3) He, indeed, admits that he cannot explain satisfactorily why Chaucer did not develop his poem to a more definite conclusion, but he seems to find comfort in the fact that the birds themselves are content with the conclusion (*ibid.*, pp. 578 f). This is merely saying that Chaucer as an artist had his own reasons for the inconclusive ending; it is not an argument for the use of the poem upon an occasion connected with a wedding.

[2] For the most detailed summary of its development, see Langhans, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 ff.

[3] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 573 f. If a this-is-so-sudden Victorian convention prevailed in the fourteenth century, Anne must have blushed with shame—if the poem was translated to her—upon remembering how she had joined with her mother and brother in authorizing negotiations for the marriage, and how, without a hint of irresolution on her part, it had been settled in England and in Bohemia, delayed only by the time required for the journeys of the ambassadors, so that she was on her way to England within nine months and married within the year after formal negotiations had begun. What a blow to her maidenly modesty if the behavior of the formel was correct!

Lange's assertion that Chaucer deliberately departs from the facts in order to avoid a tactless reference to Anne's quick acceptance of Richard's offer, which the King of France had refused—in other words, to save her imperial dignity![1]

2. The satirical element, one-seventh of the poem, the Richard-Anne theory does not attempt to explain.

3. If, in addition, it can be shown that the balance of historical evidence swings even slightly toward the conclusion that Frederick of Meissen was out of the race by 1377, or that Charles VI was never in it at all, then more props must be found if the theory is to be maintained. But in fact the evidence is strongly against both these suitors.

FREDERICK OF MEISSEN

In the case of Frederick, Professor Emerson's chief argument is that as the money pledged for the fulfilment of the contract between Frederick and Anne had not been paid by 1397, which is indicated by Frederick's seizure of the towns of Brüx and Laun, offered as security for the payment, the engagement, therefore, must have lasted until 1382, when it was nullified by Anne's marriage to Richard.[2]

The seizure of the towns proves one thing only, that the forfeit money had not then been paid. It tells nothing whatever about the date or the circumstances of the breaking of the contract.

According to Pelzel, as Professor Emerson admits, the engagement was arbitrarily broken by Anne's relatives about 1377, on account of the Mainz affair. We do not know the authority for Pelzel's statement, but Lindner accepts it; and surely Professor Emerson's opinion that there was not reason enough for breaking the engagement is no argument that it was not broken. Until

[1] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 395 f. But to argue a certain historical basis for the poem because of resemblances, and then to confirm this argument by a purely subjective explanation of admitted disagreement between the historic facts and the details of the poem is a curious logic.

Lange's other contribution to the theory—his suggestion that the formel is Anne because the two-headed eagle of the Empire is on her tomb in Westminster Abbey must have occurred to many students of the theory; but it does not work. The eagle-suitors were not sons of the Empire, nor was the formel double-headed! If the allegory were heraldic, it would have been impossible to get away from the leopards of England and the lilies of France.

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, VIII, 49 ff.

Pelzel is discredited by substantial evidence to the contrary, his statement, based upon sources to which we have not access, must outweigh an unsupported assumption that the contract of which, Pelzel and Lindner discounted, we know nothing after 1373, continued to exist until Anne's marriage to Richard.[1]

CHARLES VI OF FRANCE

Professor Emerson's identification of Charles VI as the third suitor depends upon (1) a passage in Valois; (2) an extract from a letter written by the Cardinal de Sortenac; (3, 4) two passages in Froissart; and (5) a passage in Adam of Usk's *Chronicle*.[2]

1. The quotation from Valois reads in full (italics mine):

Let us note, however, *a last hope, or rather, a last illusion, entertained at this moment by some Clementists.* During a visit of Wenzel at Aix-la-Chapelle *there was talk* of a marriage between the dauphin, son of the king of France, and Anna of Luxemburg, sister of the King of the Romans. An interview was to take place between Charles V and Wenzel. Who could say whether by virtue of the matrimonial conferences which were going to be undertaken at Rheims another agreement might not come about in the religious domain? At the very worst it would suffice (*at least they chose to believe so*) to persuade Wenzel that a change of policy would not be incompatible with the respect that he owed the memory of Charles IV [his father]. *The Court of Avignon counted much* on the result of that conference. Among other persons who promised to be there, I shall mention the envoys of the King of Portugal and at their head the Bishop of Lisbon, who was already preparing the discourse with which he meant to convert Wenzel.

This interview did not take place; the King of the Romans, turning his back upon Rheims, resumed his route to Cologne. He, it is true, had himself represented at Paris by four ambassadors; but the document, undoubtedly prepared in advance, of which they were bearers, treated only of the renewal of the alliance between the two houses, *without whispering a word of the marriage of the dauphin with Anne of Bohemia.* Too deep a difference of opinion separated thenceforth the Valois and the Luxemburgs. Anna was going to be betrothed not to the son but to the hereditary foe of Charles V, to Richard II, King of England. A marriage should seal the accord of the two great Urbanist kingdoms.

[1] Particularly in an age when such contracts were made with one hand and broken with the other. Lange's assertion (italics mine): "*In aller munde war ja auch das langjährige verlöbnis Annas mit Friedrich von Meissen,* das zur Zeit ihres 'engagement' mit Richard II formel überhaupt noch nicht gelöst war" (*loc. cit.*, p. 396) is sheer imagination.

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, VIII, 51 ff.

It was all over: it was useless to dream longer of an agreement on the question of the schism between France and Germany.[1]

The italicized phrases show unmistakably that, in the opinion of Valois, the talk grew out of a desperate effort on the part of the Clementists to win Wenzel for their pope, and that even this hope was dead when the old treaty between the Empire and France was renewed at Paris[2] without a word about the marriage.[3]

2. The letter from the Clementist Cardinal de Sortenac, written in May or June, 1380,[4] was evidently one of Valois' authorities, and therefore is not additional testimony.

3. But Professor Emerson quotes a passage from Froissart to show that Charles V on his deathbed in September, 1380, still had hopes of a marriage between his son and Anne. The King is speaking: "Seek in Germany for the marriage of Charles my son, by which alliances there may be stronger. You have heard how our adversary must and will marry there: it is all to have more alliances."[5]

[1] "Notons cependant une dernière espérance, *ou plutôt une dernière illusion, entretenue à ce moment par quelques clémentins.* Durant un séjour de Wenceslas à Aix-la-Chapelle, *on avait parlé* d'un mariage entre le dauphin, fils du roi de France, et Anna de Luxembourg, sœur du roi des Romains. Une entrevue devait avoir lieu entre Charles V et Wenceslas. Qui pouvait dire si, à la faveur des pourparlers matrimoniaux qui allaient s'engager à Reims, un autre rapprochement ne s'opérerait pas sur le terrain religieux? Au bout du compte il suffisait (*du moins on se plaisait à le croire*) de persuader à Wenceslas qu'un changement de politique n'était pas inconciliable avec le respect dû à la mémoire de Charles IV. *La cour d'Avignon comptait beaucoup* sur le résultat de cette conférence. Entre autres personnages qui promettaient de s'y rendre, je citerai les envoyés du roi de Portugal et, à leur tête, l'évêque de Lisbonne, qui déjà préparait le discours avec lequel il devait convertir Wenceslas.

"Cette entrevue n'eut pas lieu: le roi des Romains, tournant le dos à Reims, reprit la route de Cologne. Il se fit, il est vrai, représenter à Paris par quatre ambassadeurs: mais l'acte, sans doute rédigé d'avance, dont ces derniers étaient porteurs ne traitait que du renouvellement des alliances entre les deux maisons, *sans souffler mot du mariage* du dauphin avec la bohémienne Anna. Un trop profond dissentiment séparait désormais les Valois et les Luxembourg. Anna allait être fiancée non pas au fils, mais à l'ennemi héréditaire de Charles V, à Richard II, roi d'Angleterre. Un mariage devait sceller l'accord des deux grands royaumes urbanistes.

"C'en était fait: il ne fallait plus songer à une entente sur la question du schisme entre la France et l'Allemagne" (*La France et le grand schisme d'occident* [1896], I, 300 f.).

[2] Dated in another hand July 21, 1380 (Valois, *op. cit.*, p. 301, n. 1).

[3] Professor Emerson's inferences are somewhat confusing: He says first (*Mod. Phil.*, VIII, 52 f.): "*As late as that time*, therefore [April, 1380], the emperor was *still* considering the possible betrothal of his sister Anne and the heir of the French throne"; and later (*ibid.*, p. 57): "*As already shown*, it was in the spring of 1380 that there had *first* been talk of a marriage of Anne and the Dauphin of France" (italics mine).

[4] Valois, *op. cit.*, I, 319, n. 1.

[5] "Enquerés pour le mariage de Charle mon fil en Allemaigne, par quoi les aliances y soient plus fortes. Vous avés entendu comment nostre aversaire s'i doit et voelt maryer: ce est tout pour avoir plus l' alliances" (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, IX, 285).

That Froissart, however, did not think Charles V referred to Anne is shown by what he wrote later in connection with the marriage of Charles VI to Isabel of Bavaria:

For King Charles of France, of blessed memory, on his deathbed had ordained that Charles his son should be settled and married, *if place could be found for him* in Germany, in order that the Germans might make closer alliances with the French, *for he saw* that the King of England *was going to be married* to the sister of the King of Germany, in order that he might be stronger.[1]

The second passage does not quote Charles V but interprets his words as Froissart understood them. It may be objected that his interpretation is colored by the *fait accompli* of the marriage; but interval evidence in the speech bears him out: Charles V could not have used the word *seek* (*Enquerés*) in Germany if he himself had for some time been working or hoping for a particular alliance there. Moreover, the second sentence in the first quotation was superfluous unless it meant exactly what Froissart in the second passage says it meant, that Charles V was anxious that his son should make a match that would offset (by maintaining balance of power) that of Richard to Anne, which he evidently foresaw.[2] Compare also the expression "if a place could be found for him in Germany" with the purely general "and marry him in a place so high that the realm shall be stronger."[3]

If Charles V ever made any effort to court Anne for his son, evidence of it has yet to be produced.[4]

[1] "Car li rois Charles de France, de bonne mémoire, ou lit de la mort, avoit ordonné que Charles ses fils fust assegnés et mariés, *se on en pooit veoir lieu pour luy* en Alemaigne, par quoy des Alemans plus grans aliances se fesissent as François, *car il veoit* que li rois d'Engletière *estoit mariés* à le sœur dou roy d'Allemaigne, dont il valoit mieux" (*ibid.*, X, 344. Italics mine).

[2] The religious alliance of England and Bohemia initiated by the decision of the parliament of Gloucester in 1378 continued with the letter of Wenzel to Richard, May 20, 1379. The idea of the marriage may have originated in the spring of 1379 when Michael de la Pole seems to have been sent to Wenzel's court to discuss it. Certainly the Cardinal de Prata, who was sent by Pope Urban to Wenzel in 1379, and who went on to England in 1380, was concerned with that alliance; and Burley, who went to Bohemia in June, 1380, went with a definite proposition. For detailed discussion of the negotiations between England and Bohemia at this time, see C. G. Chamberlayne, *Die Heirat Richards II von England mit Anna von Luxemburg* (Halle, 1906), especially pp. 19 ff.; and J. J. Heeren, *Das Bündniss zwischen König Richard II von England und König Wenzel von Jahre 1381* (Halle, 1910), pp. 16 ff.

[3] This, according to Froissart, was also said by Charles V on his deathbed (*op. cit.*, IX, 285).

[4] The initiative in renewing the old treaty, even, came from Wenzel.

4. The active courtship, then, to which Professor Emerson refers, must have been conducted, if at all, by Charles VI himself after he came to the throne in September, 1380. On this point Professor Emerson again uses Froissart as authority. In order to make the objections to his inference clear I quote the passage in full:

So were these affairs conducted that the King of the Romans sent his sister to England, the Duke of Tassem in her company, and a great train of knights and squires, of dames and damsels, in state and array, as befitted such a lady; and they came to Brabant, to the city of Brussels. There the Duke, Wenceslas of Brabant, and the Duchess, Jeanne his wife, received the young lady and her train with great splendor; for the Duke was her uncle: she was the daughter of the Emperor Charles, his brother. And so Madame Anne of Bohemia remained at Brussels with her uncle and her fair aunt for more than a month without leaving; she did not dare budge—I will tell you the reason why. *She and her council were informed* that there were about XII armed vessels full of Normans on the sea, hovering between Calais and Holland, and robbing and pillaging on the sea everything that they met, without regard for anyone; and *a rumor ran up and down* the sea-coast of Flanders and of Zeeland that they remained there waiting for the arrival of the young lady, and that the King of France and his council were going to have the lady carried off to break this marriage; for they were in great fear of alliances between the Germans and the English. And *people said furthermore, when they were talking,* that it was not honorable to seize or to carry off ladies in the wars of lords; but the answer made to color and make look better the quarrel of the King of France, was: "How is it you do not remember that the Prince of Wales, father of the present king of England, had carried off—and agreed to the deed—Madame de Bourbon, mother of the queen of France, who was seized and taken away by the prince's people, and all through that war was in the castle of Belle-Perce? God help me, it was so; and she was taken to Guienne and ransomed. Now in a similar case, if the French, by way of revenge, should seize the wife of the King of England, they would not be wronging anyone."

Because of these doubts and the general look of affairs, the lady and all her train stayed at Brussels a whole month and until the Duke of Brabant, her uncle, sent to France his councillors, the Signeur de Rocelare and the Signeur de Bouquehort, to remonstrate about these things with the King of France and his uncles, who were nephews of the Duke of Brabant, being his sister's sons. These knights of Brabant so managed, and talked so well to the King of France and his council, that favor was shown them, and good safe-conducts were given to pass where they [Anne and her train] pleased—they and theirs—were it within the realm of France or along the frontier in going to Calais; and the Normans who were out at sea

were called home. All this the above-mentioned knights of Brabant reported to the Duke and to the Duchess; and the King and his uncles wrote them that at their request and in consideration of them and of no other, they [the French king and his uncles] had shown this favor to their cousin of Bohemia.[1]

Here we must distinguish between fact and rumor. Froissart states as facts the report about the Norman pirates, Anne's fear, the embassy to Paris to get safe-conducts, and the reply of Charles and his uncles. There is no reason to doubt any of this. Froissart was in a position to know what went on at Brussels,[2] and no motive for such an elaborate invention appears. Moreover, it is a fact that on October 15, the Emperor Wenzel issued a commission to the Duke of Teschen to go to Paris to announce the marriage of Anne, and to offer the Emperor's services in prolonging the truce or in making

[1] "Tant avoient esté ces coses demenées que li rois des Rommains envoioit sa soer en Engletière, li duc de Tassem en sa compaignie et grant fuisson de chevaliers et d'escuiers, de dames et de damoiselles en estat et en arroy, enssi comme à tel dame appartenoit; et vinrent en Braibant en le ville de Brousselles. Là requellièrent li dus Wincelins de Braibant et la ducoise Jehane sa femme la jone dame et sa compaignie moult grandement, car li dus en estoit oncles: elle avoit esté fille de le'mpereur Charle son frère. Et se tint madame Anne de Behaigne à Brousselles dallés son oncle et sa belle ante plus d'un mois sans partir, ne bougier, ne s'osoit, je vous diray raison pour quoy. Elle fu segnefye, et ses consaulx, que il y avoit environ XII vaissaulx armés plains de Normans sus la mer, qui waucroient entre Callais et Hollandes, et pilloient et desreuboient sus le mer tout ce que il trouvoient, et n'avoient cure sur qui; *et alloit et couroit renommée* sus les bondes de celle mer de Flandres et de Zellandes que il se tenoient là en attendant la venue de la jone dame, et que li rois de France et ses consaulx voloient faire ravir la dame pour brisier che mariage; car il se doubtoient grandement des alliances des Allemans et des Englès. *Et dissoit-on encores avant, quant on parloit,* que ce n'estoit pas honnerable cose de prendre, ne de ravir dames en guerres de signeurs, mès on respondoit en coulourant et en faissant le querelle dou roy de France plus belle: 'Comment ne veistes-vous pas que li princes de Galles, pères de che roy d'Engletière, que il fist ravir et consenty le fait de madame de Bourbonnois, mère à la royne de France, qui fu prise et emblée des gens dou princes, et tout de celle guerre, ens ou castiel de Belle-Perce? M'aist Dieu, si fu, et menée ent en Gienne et rançonnée. Ossi par pareille cose, se li François, pour eux contrevengier, prendoient le moullier dou roy d'Engletière, il ne feroient à nulluy tort.'

"Pour ces doubtes et les apparans que on en veoit, se tint la dame et toute sa route à Brouselles un mois tout entier, et tant que li dus de Braibant ses oncles envoya en France son conseil le signeur de Rocelare et le signeur de Bouquehort pour remonstrer ces coses au roy de France et à ses oncles, liquel estoient ossi neveut dou duc de Braibant et fils de sa soer. Cil chevalier de Braibant exploitièrent tant, et si bellement parlèrent au roy de France et à son conseil, que grâce li fu faite et bons sauf-conduis donnés de passer où il li plaissoit, li et les siens, fust parmy le roiaulme de France ou sus les frontières en allant jusques à Callais, et furent li Normant qui se tenoient sus mer, remandés. Tout che raportèrent li dessus dit chevalier en Braibant au duc et à la ducoise et leur escripsoient li rois et si oncle que, à leur pryère et contemplation et non d'autrui, il faissoient celle grâce à leur cousine de Behaigne" (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, IX, 459 ff. Italics mine).

[2] The Duke of Brabant was his patron and friend. He claims to have been "moult privé et acointé" with him (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, I, 246 ff.); and at this time Froissart lived at Lestines-sur-Mont, within easy riding distance of Brussels.

peace between France and England.[1] Of this journey we have no details, but it may well have been partly responsible for Anne's long stay at Brussels.

Again, it is easy to see the basis of the report that frightened Anne. For four successive summers (1377–80) a French fleet under the admiral Jean de Vienne had raided the English coast and terrorized Channel traffic. In August, 1380, they even went up the Thames and burned Gravesend, only a few miles from London. This fleet was Norman in that its headquarters was at Rouen, and it undoubtedly was manned largely by Normans.[2] The only reason why it was inactive in 1381 was that Charles V on his deathbed had forced a truce with England by stopping supplies for war.[3]

For this reason if any Norman ships sailed from Rouen in 1381, they *were* pirates. Further, during the Great Rebellion in England that summer men were accused in London of taking money from Vienne to facilitate his landing on the south coast. Though this charge was almost certainly false—Vienne had no money for such a purpose—the report of it was enough to frighten Anne into asking for safe conduct.[4]

But the clauses italicized are used by Froissart to distinguish between fact and rumor. The rumor of the kidnaping plan evidently grew out of the well-known French fear of the alliance of the two great Urbanist kingdoms.[5] That the rumor was unfounded scarcely needs argument. To kidnap Anne meant war with England and

[1] E. Winkelmann, *Acta Imperii Inedita Seculi XIII et XIV* (1880, 1885), II, 641 f. It would seem as if he should have asked for the passports. Is he the "autrui" of the last sentence in the Froissart passage?

[2] Terrier de Loray, *Jean de Vienne* (1877), chaps. v–vii, with documents referred to. The Rolls of Parliament confirm this. In 1379, the Commons complained of the great harm done by "barges et balyngers de Normandie et autres ennemys sur la mier."

[3] Cf. *Mandements de Charles V*, 1955.

[4] Cf. Oman, *The Great Revolt of 1381* (1906), p. 140, with n. 3, and Petit-Dutaillis, Introduction to Réville's *Soulèvement des Travailleurs d'Angleterre* (1898), LVIII, n. 2. That Anne was kept informed about the insurrection appears from the *Town and Port Records of New Romney*, which say that the men of that town who sent a barge to bring the Queen across began their preparations in October, "and the Queen (at this time) did not come to England, nor did she wish to come until peace should be made again of the rebels aforesaid" (*Archaeol. Cant.*, XIII, 209). This might of course have been true, quite apart from any plans of Jean de Vienne, as all through the autumn the English government was harassed by rumors that rebellion was about to break out again (Oman, *op. cit.*, p. 148).

[5] See the words of Charles V quoted on pp. 8 f. above.

Bohemia, and the French war chest was empty.[1] But Professor Emerson observes that mere talk of Charles's courtship might have given him a place in the poem. Is it conceivable that if such talk existed it would not at once have associated itself with the rumor quoted by Froissart and served to motivate it? Why should the gossips have gone back to the old case of the dowager Duchess of Bourbon, who was kidnaped for ransom, not "to break a marriage," if it was generally believed that the French King was a disappointed suitor of Anne? And if it was not true, or even generally believed, how should Chaucer have heard of it, and why should he have made Charles the third suitor?[2]

5. There is, however, one plain assertion that Anne was courted by the King of France. It is quoted by Professor Emerson from the *Chronicle* of Adam of Usk. If Adam was right, he had a "scoop"! It is fair to ask how he got it. The source is suggested by the passage in which the statement occurs:

In this same year there came into England one Pileus, cardinal priest of Saint Praxedes, to treat, on behalf of the emperor of Germany and king of Bohemia, with the council of England of and about a marriage between our king and the lady Ann, sister of the same emperor; who afterwards became thereby our most gracious queen, howbeit she died without issue. At his coming, this cardinal, falsely feigning himself legate *a latere* and as having the power of the pope, then did exercise the papal offices. And among other things he made me notary, though to no purpose, in the house of the friars preachers of London, where he was then dwelling. Thus did he gather to himself countless money, and, the treaty of marriage being settled, he departed from England with his gains, to his own condemnation; idly trusting that the pope would approve these his acts. And, after his departure, the said lady Ann was bought for a great price by our lord the king, for she was much sought in marriage by the king of France; and she was then sent over into England to be crowned queen.[3]

[1] See p. 12 above. In this connection should be noted the conciliatory attitude of the French when in the spring of 1381 Wenzel threatened on religious grounds to break the old alliance renewed in 1380 (Valois, *op. cit.*, II, 274 ff.).

[2] Cf. also Chamberlayne's argument, *loc. cit.*

[3] "Isto eodem anno, venit quidam in Angliam dictus Pilius, tituli Sancte Praxedis presbiter cardinalis, ad tractandum cum concilio Anglie, ex parte imperatoris Almanie, regis Boemie, de et super matrimonio inter regem nostrum predictum et dominam Annam, dicti imperatoris sororem, postea ex eo capite Anglie reginam benignissimam, licet sine prole defunctam. Ineundo cardinalis iste, false se fingens legatum a latere esse ac potestatem pape habere, vices papales tunc excercuit; me inter cetera notarium tunc, licet inutiliter, in domo fratrum predicacionis Londonie, ubi tunc morabatur, creavit. Infinitam pecuniam sic collegit, et ab Anglia cum eadem pecunia, eodem tractatu

Before examining this passage, it is necessary to observe that by his own assertion Adam is known to have written from memory all of his chronicle before the year 1394,[1] and also that a reference under the year 1382 to an event of the year 1414[2] shows that in the case of Prata his memory was going back thirty-two years. This fact alone discredits his statements sufficiently. But what was the source of his idea?

It is clear from the passage quoted that he had personal relations with Prata, which resulted in a bitter sense of having been cheated. We can infer almost with certainty what had happened. Adam tells us that Prata had made him "notary." It cannot be doubted that he means "papal notary,"[3] and that the appointment was either not confirmed or was later canceled. Now Prata was the famous turncoat of the age, and when he went over to Clement VII in 1386 Adam would certainly have lost his office.[4] But between 1378 and 1380 Prata was the chief rounder-up of the Urbanist forces, traveling from country to country;[5] and if anyone was likely to hear of the Clementist "illusion" of the spring of 1380 he was the man. Thus it might easily have reached Adam at the time of their personal association.[6]

But in any case the unsupported assertion of a thoroughly unreliable witness,[7] made confessedly from memory thirty-two years after the event, is scarcely convincing evidence of the activity of Charles VI as a suitor for Anne. The case, then, reduces to the desperate hope of some of the Clementists in the spring of 1380. Further,

---

matrimonii expedito, ad sui recessit dampnacionem; credens tamen, licet in vanum, facta sua hujusmodi per papam ratificari. Post cujus recessum, dicta domina Anna, per dominum regem magno precio redempta, quia a rege Francie in uxorem affectata, in Angliam et Anglie reginam transmittitur coronanda" (*Chronicon Adae de Usk, 1377–1421* [ed. Maunde Thompson, 1904], pp. 2 f.).

[1] *Chronicon Adae de Usk, 1377–1421* (ed Maunde Thompson, 1904), p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[3] Cf. Du Cange, *s.v. Notarii Apostolici.*

[4] Prata may have been playing a double game for some time. Urban suspected him in 1385 (cf. Valois, *op. cit.*, II, 118, n. 2).

[5] He was in England in 1380 (cf. Rymer, *Foedera*, VII, 256).

[6] Sir Edward Maunde Thompson suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 140, n. 1) that Adam's "scoop" may have grown out of the Froissart rumor that the French king meant to kidnap Anne; but in that case why should it have remained a "scoop"?

[7] Note the continual corrections in the footnotes to Maunde Thompson's translation, pp. 137 ff.

it appears that, as Höfler[1] suggests, not even they took the plan very seriously. The truth was that as neither pope would agree to a Church council[2] the marriage of Anne with the Dauphin of France was not a practicable way of ending the schism.

As the Richard-Anne theory, then, neither fits nor explains *The Parlement of Foules*, and as the evidence submitted in support of the identification of Frederick of Meissen and Charles VI of France as the second and third suitors does not show that either of these princes could have been regarded as Richard's rivals when he was courting Anne,[3] I conclude that if we are to have a historical explanation of the poem, we must look elsewhere for it.

MARRIAGE PLANS FOR PHILIPPA OF LANCASTER

Such a situation suggests itself in 1381 in the three possibilities of marriage associated with the name of Philippa of Lancaster, eldest daughter of John of Gaunt. They involved: (1) her first cousin, King Richard; (2) her second cousin, William of Hainaut (or Bavaria); (3) John of Blois, one of the rival claimants to the duchy of Brittany.

KING RICHARD

1. For the existence of the first plan a single passage in Froissart is sole authority:

At that time there were great councils in England of the King's uncles, the prelates, and the barons of the land for marrying the young king Richard, and the English would have liked to see him married in

[1] *Anna von Luxemburg* (*Denkschr. der Kais. Acad. der Wissensch. Phil.-Hist. Classe* 1871), XX, 131.

[2] Valois, *op. cit.*, I, 318 f.

[3] An argument of which I have made no use is that of the order of precedence of the suitors. It should be summed up if only because so much is made of the subject in the poem itself.

Nature says that the "tercel egle" who is above the other birds "in degree" shall choose his mate first, and after him the other birds "by order" (ll. 379 ff.). Later, it is made clear again that the first eagle is highest in rank (l. 552), and the second "of lower kinde" (l. 450). Although nothing is said about the rank of the third eagle, it is impossible for me to agree with Professor Emerson that this omission is intentional ambiguity because of the anomalous position of Charles VI. As the birds are to speak in the order of their rank, the third must be of "lower kinde" than the second. However much Charles's title was challenged by the English, they could not have denied that by the medieval theory of precedence, he was on three counts at least entitled to speak before Frederick: he was the head of the House of Valois, he was a reigning king, and he was older than the heir of Meissen. However much Richard hated his "adversary," he could not have been pleased by a subversion of court etiquette which placed his second cousin after a younger prince of lower rank.

Hainaut for love of Good Queen Philippa, their lady, who had been to them so kind, so generous, and so honorable, and who had been born in Hainaut; but Duke Albert at that time had no daughter old enough to be married. *The Duke of Lancaster would have been glad to see the King his cousin take the daughter that he had by Madame Blanche of Lancaster, his first wife; but the country would by no means consent to it for two reasons: one was that the lady was his cousin german and therefore too nearly related to him, and the other that it was desired that the King should marry over seas in order to have more alliances.* So was put forward the sister of the young king Charles [Wenzel] of Bohemia and Germany, daughter of the late emperor of Rome. Of this opinion were all the councils of England. So was commissioned to go into Germany and to treat for this marriage a very brave knight of the King, who had been his tutor, and who had been very intimate with the Prince of Wales, his father. This knight was called Sir Simon Burley, a wise man and experienced in treaty-making. Sir Simon was granted everything that was necessary for his mission, money, and other things; so he left England and arrived at Calais, thence came to Gravelines and to Bruges, and from Bruges to Ghent, and from Ghent to Brussels; and there he found Duke Wenceslas of Brabant, and Duke Albert, the Count of Blois, the Count of Saint-Pol, Sir Robert de Namur, Sir William de Namur, and a great host of knights of Hainaut and of Brabant; for there was going on a great fête of jousting and pleasure; and for this had all these lords assembled. The Duke and Duchess of Brabant in honor of the King of England received the knight very cordially, and when they knew the reason why he was going into Germany, they were very glad and said that this was a thing well undertaken between the King of England and their niece. They delivered to Sir Simon Burley at his departure special letters addressed to the King of Germany, declaring that they had great liking for this match. So the knight left Brussels, and took the Louvain road on his way to Cologne.[1]

[1] "En celle saison eut grans consaulx en Engletierre des oncles dou roy, des prélas et des barons dou païs pour le jone roy Richart d'Engletierre maryer, et euissent volentiers li Englès veu que il se fuist maryés en Haynau pour l'amour de la bonne royne Phelippe leur dame, qui leur fu si bonne, si large et si honnerable, qui avoit esté de Haynnau; mais li dus Aubiers en che tamps n'avoit nulle fille en point pour marier. *Li dus de Lancastre euist volentiers veu que li rois ses cousins euist pris sa fille que il eut de madame Blance de Lancastre, sa première femme; mais li païs ne le voloit mies consentir pour deus raisons: li une estoit que la dame estoit sa cousine giermainne, che par quoy estoit trop grant proïsmeté, et li autre que on voloit que li rois se mariast oultre le mer pour avoir plus de aliances.* Si fu mist avant la soer dou jone roy Charle [Wenzel] de Boësme et d'Allemaigne, fille à l'empereur de Romme qui avoit esté. A tel avis se tinrent tout li consaulx d'Engletierre. Si en fu cargiés pour aller en Alemaigne et pour tretier che mariage uns moult vaillans chevaliers dou roy, qui avoit esté ses maistres et fu toudis moult prochains dou prince de Galles son père. Si estoit nommés li chevaliers messires Simons Burlé, sage homme et grant tretieur durement. Si fu à messire Simon ordonné tout che que à li appartenoit, tant de mises comme de autres coses; si se parti d'Engleterre et arriva à Calais, et de là vint-il à Gravelines et à Bruges, et de Bruges à Gand, et de Gand à Brouselles, et là trouva le duck Wencelin de Braibant et le duck Aubiert, le conte de Blois, le conte de Saint-Pol, messire Robert de Namur, messire

In regard to this passage it must be granted that Froissart could have obtained his information at first hand from either the Duke of Brabant[1] or Burley. It is patent that Froissart wrote immediately after the event described. He knows all about the route taken to Brussels and the fête there, but he leaves the envoys on the road to Cologne without a hint as to what was the result of their mission.[2]

The content of the first part of the paragraph is credible and to some extent supported: that the English were devoted to Queen Philippa and would have liked a Hainaut match for her sake; that Albert of Bavaria had at this time no marriageable daughter; that the English people were anxious for "aliances" abroad;[3] and that if the proposal was made the objection of consanguinity would certainly have been raised.[4]

Froissart, presumably voicing Burley, does not say that a definite plan for the marriage of the royal cousins was ever proposed in Parliament and rejected; he merely expresses a general attitude on the part of Lancaster and two clearly stated objections on the part of the "country"—how made clear we are not told.

This ambition is in entire accord with all that we know of Lancaster. It was an almost inevitable middle step between his early attempts to divert the succession to his own line[5] and his efforts in

---

Guillaume de Namur et grant fuisson de chevaliers de Haynnau et de Braibant; car là avoit une grosse feste de joustes et de behourt: pour ce y estoient tout cil signeur asamblé. Li dus de Braibant et la duçoise rechurent, pour l'onneur dou roy d'Engletierre, le chevalier moult liement, et quant il sceurent la cause pour quoi il aloit en Allemaigne, sy en furent tout resjoï et dissent que ce estoit une cose bien prise dou roy d'Engletierre et de leur nièce. Si cargièrent à messire Simon Burlé à son département lettres espéciaulx adrechans au roy d'Allemaigne, en remonstrant que il avoient grant affection en ce mariage. Si se party de Brouselles li chevaliers, et prist le chemin de Louvain pour aler à Coulongne" (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, IX, 212 f. Italics mine).

[1] See p. 11 above.

[2] Froissart does not name the other envoys; but Burley was the leader of the embassy, and the one in whom for personal reasons, the chronicler was interested.

[3] Witness the earlier marriage negotiations for Richard: with Visconti and twice with his "adversary," the King of France.

[4] As happened in 1394, when Gloucester wished Richard to marry his daughter (Froissart, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XV, 155).

[5] For an extreme statement, see *Chronicon Angliae 1328–88* (Rolls ed.), pp. 92 f. Cf. also Ramsay, *The Genesis of Lancaster* (1913), II, 55; Longmans, *The Life and Times of Edward III* (1869), II, 255 f.; Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (1900), p. 28; but cf. Armitage-Smith, *John of Gaunt* (1904), p. 130.

old age to assure the succession to his son.[1] By marrying Philippa to Richard he would gain for himself much more control over the king and the succession for his line.

On these grounds it is practically certain that he desired the match, highly probable that he worked for it, and equally probable that the "country"—the middle and lower classes, who hated and feared him as the leader of the feudal nobility[2]—would have had none of the plan. But knowing how often royal marriage negotiations fell through, notably in the case of Richard, he might well have entertained some hope of the alliance until the King was actually married to another.[3] And unless he had this ambition, why had he allowed his eldest daughter to reach the mature age of twenty-one unmarried?

WILLIAM OF HAINAUT

2. In connection with the account of the marriage of William of Hainaut with Marie of Burgundy in the spring of 1385, Froissart relates an embassy from Lancaster to William's father, Duke Albert, as follows (italics mine):

The master of the wool staple of all England spoke first, showing his credentials and uttering many compliments from the Duke of Lancaster to his cousin Albert, and then speaking of many matters with which they had been commissioned. Among other things he asked Duke Albert, as I was informed at the time, whether it was his intent to persevere in this marriage with the children[4] of the Duke of Burgundy. At this word Duke

[1] Hardyng declares that Lancaster had a chronicle forged to prove that Edmund Crouchback, ancestor of his wife (Blanche), was the elder son of King Henry III and King Edward I, the younger. This would give his son a claim to the throne through the mother.

Hardyng says further that he had often heard the Earl of Northumberland declare he had heard Lancaster ask in Parliament to be made Richard's heir, "consyderynge howe the kynge was like to have no issue of his bodie" (*Archaeologia*, XX, n. 186).

Another chronicler (writing before 1471) reports that in 1390–91 Lancaster tried to get Parliament to declare his son heir to the throne (*An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard I, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI* [Camden Society, 1856], p. 7).

[2] This is thoroughly established. The feeling was voiced in *Piers Plowman*, "Belling the Cat." For its further bearing on the interpretation of *The Parlement of Foules*, see p. 28 below.

[3] It is a curious coincidence that the very first business proposed in Parliament after the King's wedding was Lancaster's demand for money to go to Portugal (*Rolls of Parl.*, III, 113 f.). The league with Portugal had been concluded at the very time when Richard's marriage became a certainty; and immediately afterward Lancaster turned his ambitions to Spain again. As soon as he could get money and men, he went to the Peninsula and straightway married one daughter to the king of Portugal, the other to the king of Castile.

[4] It was a double match: William's sister was married at the same time to the heir of Burgundy.

Albert changed color a little and said: "Yes, sir. By my faith! Why do you ask?" "My lord," said he, "I speak of it because my lord, *the Duke of Lancaster, has always hoped until now that Mademoiselle Philippa, his daughter, would have my lord, your son.*" Then Duke Albert said: "Friend, tell my cousin that when he has married or will marry his children, I will not meddle with the matter. Nor has he any business to interfere about my children—as to when I shall marry them, nor where, nor how, nor to whom." This was the reply which the English had at that time from Duke Albert. This master of the wool staple and his companions took leave of the Duke after dinner, and went to Valenciennes to spend the night, and in the morning they returned to Ghent. Of them I shall say no more; I believe that they returned to England.[1]

Here again Froissart seems to be on firm ground. The marriage of William to Marie of Burgundy had been engineered by the Duchess of Brabant, the widow of Froissart's friend and patron.[2] The elaboration of detail, with conversations and explanations, shows that the account came either from the Duchess herself or from someone intimate with her, an eyewitness of the dinner scene, who noticed the Duke's change of color.[3]

In this account there are two significant points: (1) even with his change of color, which may have been due to either anger or embarrassment, Albert does not deny the compact; (2) the English speaker uses the word *always*. Whether this is to be taken literally as meaning "from birth," or refers to 1372, when Lancaster asked an

[1] "Li maistres de l'estaple des lainnes de toute Engletière parla premiers, quant il ot monstré ses lettres de créance, et recommanda moult grandement le duc de Lancastre et son cousin le duc Aubert, et puis parla de pluiseurs coses dont il estoient cargiet. Entre les autres coses il demanda au duc Aubert, sicom je fuy adont infourmés, se ce estoit se entente de persévérer en che mariage as enffans le duc de Bourgongne. De ceste parolle li dus Aubers mua un petit couleur et dist: 'Oïl, sire. Par ma foy! pourquoi le demandés-vous?' 'Monsigneur,' dist-il, 'j'en parolle pour ce que *monsigneur le duc de Lancastre à tousjours espéré jusques à chi que mademoiselle Phelippe sa fille aroit Guillaume monsigneur vostre fil.*' Lors dist li dus Aubers: 'Compains, dites à mon cousin que quant il a mariet ou mariera ses enffans, que point je ne m'en ensonnieray. Ossi ne s'a-il que faire d'ensonnyer de mes enffans, ne quant je les voel marier, ne où, ne comment, ne à qui.' Che fu la response que li Englès orent adont dou duc Aubert. Chil maistre de l'estable et si compaignon prisent congiet au duc apriès disner, et s'en vinrent jésir à Valenchiennes, et à l'endemain il s'en retournèrent à Gand. De eux je ne say plus avant, je croy bien que il retournèrent en Engletière" (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, X, 313 f.).

[2] She twice mentions Lancaster's hope (*op. cit.*, X, 307 ff.). She assures Albert, "je say de verité."

[3] Froissart himself was not present. He is careful to say "sicom je fuy adont informés," and "*je croy bien* que il retournèrent en Engletière"; but his very care to distinguish between fact and conjecture strengthens belief in the narrative.

aid "pour nostre fille marier,"[1] it is not important to determine. The point is that in 1385 he claimed, uncontradicted by Albert, that he had "always" hoped to marry his daughter to William. In that case he entertained this hope in 1381, but undoubtedly with the mental reservation that it would be forgotten if a better match offered.[2]

JOHN OF BLOIS

3. The story of John of Blois, Froissart tells three times, in each account stressing different details. It is worth while to place them parallel:

A	B	C
It is true that at this time these two lords, John and Guy of Brittany, who were children of Saint Charles of Blois, and who were prisoners in England and shut up in a castle in the keeping of Sir John	And John of Brittany	So was the said John of Brittany
d'Aubrecicourt, were sent for and summoned fair and courteously by the council of the King of England, and	was brought into the presence of the King and his uncles and the council,	brought into the presence of the King and lords

[1] *John of Gaunt's Register* (Camden Society), I, No. 245 (April 22). Mr. Armitage-Smith (*op. cit.*, p. 214) thinks that this plea may have been merely an excuse to raise money; but it should be noted that Lancaster did not scruple to raise money simply "in relief of his great necessities." This suggests a real basis for the other excuse. The arrangement may have dated back to 1367, when Albert was in England (William being two years old and Philippa seven).

William like Anne had had previous engagements. In fact he (more probably than his brother Albert) was engaged to Anne herself from 1371 to 1373 (Pelzel, *Lebensgesch. des röm. u. böhm. Kais. Wenceslaus* [1788], p. 110). From 1374 to 1377 he was contracted to the French princess Marie (Devillers, *Cartul. des Comtes de Hain.* [1881], II, 218 ff.). But in the making and breaking of these royal marriages many diplomatic threads were intertwined, which were acknowledged and disregarded according to the policy of the moment. For instance, Richard himself seems to have negotiated for the princess Marie while she was contracted to William. In any case, if Lancaster had had an early understanding with Albert, even if only informal (cf. Froissart, "à tout le mains on ly avoit fait et donné à entendre" [*op. cit.*, X, 312]), he could have forgotten it and neglected Albert's efforts to marry his son while his own schemes were looking in other directions, and remembered it when it suited his purpose to do so.

[2] The author of an anonymous French chronicle (MS 11139) says that William loved the daughter of the Duke of Lancaster, but that the Duchess of Brabant prevented the marriage (Froissart, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, X, 553 f.); but I am not basing any argument upon this because from this statement I cannot tell whether or not the Chronicle is derived from Froissart. The word "loved," indeed, suggests further information.

A	B	C
it was said to them that if they would take as fief the duchy of Brittany from the King of England, and would recognize him as king in fealty and homage, they would be restored to their heritage,	and it was said to him: "John, if you will take as fief the duchy of Brittany and hold it of the King of England, you shall be freed from prison and established in the lordship of Brittany,	and it was said to him that he should be made duke of Brittany and that for him should be recovered all his heritage of Brittany,
and John the elder should have in marriage Madame Philippa of Lancaster, daughter of the Duke, whom he had by the duchess Blanche of Lancaster. They answered that they would do nothing of the sort, and that they would remain good Frenchmen if they had to die in prison. Thus the matter rested at that point, and when their firm resolve was known, they were not asked again.[1]	and you shall be married well and nobly in this land," as would have happened, for the Duke of Lancaster wished to give him his daughter Philippa —she who was later queen of Portugal. John of Brittany replied that he would not make this treaty, or become hostile or opposed to the Crown of France; he would gladly marry the daughter of the Duke of Lancaster, but on condition that he should be freed from England. Then he was sent back to prison.[2]	and he should have to wife Madame Philippa of Lancaster, daughter of the Duke of Lancaster, but that he should be willing to hold the duchy of Brittany in fealty and homage of the King of England, which thing he would not do. He was well content to take in marriage the lady daughter of the Duke, but that he should take oath against the Crown of France, that he would never do, even if he should remain in prison as long as he had been there, and as long as he lived they should

[1] "Voirs est que en ce tamps chil doy signeur, Jehan et Guy de Bretaigne, qui furent enfant à saint Charle de Blois, liquel estoient prisonnier en Engletière et enclos en un castiel en la garde de messire Jehan d'Aubrecicourt, furent requis et appellé bellement et doucement dou conseil dou roy d'Engletière, et leur fu dit que, se il voloient relever la ducé de Bretaigne dou roy d'Engletière et recongnoistre en foy et en hommage dou roy, on leur feroit recouvrer leur hiretage, et aroit Jehans li aisnés en mariage madame Phelippe de Lancastre, fille dou duc que il eut de la ducoise Blance de Lancastre. Il respondirent que il n'en feroient riens, et que, pour morir en prison, il demoroient bon François. Si demora la cose en cel estat, ne depuis, quant on sceut leur ferme entente, il n'en furent point requis" (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, IX, 462 f.).

[2] "Et fut Jehan de Bretaigne amené en la présence du roy et de ses oncles et du conseil, et luy fut dit: 'Jehan, se vous voulés relever la duchié de Bretaigne et tenir du roy d'Angleterre, vous serés délivré hors de prison et remis en la possession et seignourie de Bretaigne, et serés marié bien et haultement en ce pays,' sicomme il eust esté, car le duc de Lancastre luy vouloit donner sa fille Phelippe, celle qui fut puis royne de Portingal. Jehan de Bretaigne respondi que jà ne feroit ce traittié, ne ne seroit ennemy, ne contraire à la couronne de France; il prendroit bien à femme la fille au duc de Lancastre, mais que il fust délivré d'Angleterre. Or fut-il remys en prison" (*ibid.*, XII, 62 f.).

A	B	C
		get nothing different from him. When the King and his council saw this, they grew cold in showing him favor, and he was sent away in the keeping of Sir John d'Aubrecicourt, as is told at greater length here below.[1]

Once more Froissart was in a peculiarly favorable position to get facts at first hand. After the death of the Duke of Brabant in 1383, he entered the service of Guy of Blois, cousin and nearest kinsman of the very John of Blois in question.

The three versions of the offer in Froissart entirely agree in essentials, but each has a different emphasis.

A gives a brief summary of the situation of John and Guy in explaining how John de Montfort's wife (Richard's half-sister) happened to be in England in 1382.

B, in explaining how the Constable Clisson had John of Blois freed in 1387 and married him to his daughter, quotes the offer made to him of the hand of Philippa and summarizes his reply.

C, in explaining the quarrel between Clisson and Montfort, summarizes the offer, but gives in indirect quotation apparently the very words of John's reply. It alone gives the significant detail that afterward "they grew cold in showing favor to him," which implies that for a time, however short, he was remanded from prison.

A careful comparison of these three versions suggests strongly that Froissart had a first-hand report of the scene at the council;

[1] "Si fut le dit Jehan de Bretaigne amené en la présence du roy et des seigneurs, et luy fut dit que l'on le feroit duc de Bretaigne, et luy seroit tout recouvré l'eritaige de Bretaigne, et aroit à femme madame Phelippe de Lancastre, fille au duc de Lancastre, mais que la duché de Bretaigne voulsist tenir en foy et hommaige et tout relever du roy d'Angleterre, laquelle chose il ne voult faire. Il estoit assés content de prendre par mariage la dame fille du duc, mais que il eust juré contre la couronne de France, il ne l'eust jamais fait pour demourer en prison autant comme il i avoit esté, et au fort toute sa vie n'en sceut-l'en avoir autre chose. Quant le roy et son conseil veyt ce, l'on se reffroida de luy faire grâce, et fut renvoié en la garde de messire Jehan d'Aubrecicourt, ainsi que cy-dessus est plus au loing contenu" (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XII, 157).

and it is difficult to see how this could have reached him except through either Guy or John of Blois, or some one in their confidence.

It is noteworthy that in this very connection he states emphatically that he is telling the exact truth, as his patron was anxious that his history should not be colored by the hostility between the houses of Blois and Montfort.[1]

The idea of marrying Philippa to John of Blois could scarcely have arisen before January 15, 1381. At that date Montfort, although he was married to Richard's half-sister, forsook the English and returned to his allegiance to the French king. Lancaster as generalissimo of the English army must have been immediately informed of the defection of Montfort, but although the latter signed a treaty with Charles VI on January 15, this was not ratified by the Breton estates until April 10; whereupon the English army sailed home.[2] Only during the winter of 1381 could this plan have been talked about, as it must have terminated abruptly with the declaration of John that he would be *assés content* to marry Philippa but that he would never renounce his allegiance to France.[3]

By St. Valentine's Day, 1381, it is altogether probable that all three possibilities were in the mind of Lancaster. True, the ambassadors of Wenzel were on their way, but no one knew with what terms and conditions; there was still a chance that the negotiations might come to nothing, as had happened in earlier attempts to marry Richard to a foreign princess. If the Bohemian marriage should be determined upon, there was still the old contract with William of Hainaut; and there was the new project of making John of Blois his son-in-law and of establishing him as duke of Brittany, in order to hold that country in allegiance to England, and especially to himself.[4]

[1] *Ibid.*, XII, 154.

[2] *Ibid.*, IX, 332 ff.; also Dom Morice, *Hist. de Bretagne* (1835), V, 297 ff.

[3] Although we do not know the exact date of the council meeting, it would naturally have taken place soon after the defection of Brittany was certain, that is, after April 10, 1381.

[4] There is a possible objection to St. Valentine's Day. If as De la Borderie says (*Hist. de Bretagne* [1906], IV, 66) the English did not suspect Montfort's defection until April 10, the marriage plan must have come after that date. But Montfort had been vacillating in his allegiance to England ever since the death of Charles V (September, 1380). It is difficult to believe that his attitude was a secret to the initiated.

PHILIPPA AND THE FORMEL

How far does this historical situation fit and explain the poem?

The suitability of Philippa of Lancaster to the part of the formel needs no elaborate argument. About this time or very little later she was mentioned by name in a poem by Deschamps[1] as patroness of the Order of the Flower. The compliments suggest a very attractive woman:

Et qui vouldra avoir la congnoissance
Du tresdoulx nom que par oir congnoy
Et du pais ou est sa demourance
Voist en l'ille d'Albyon en recoy,
En Lancastre le trouvera, ce croy.
P.H. et E.L.I.P.P.E. trace,
Assemble tout; ces. VIII. lettres compasse,
S'aras le nom de la fleur de valour,
Qui a gent corps, beaux yeux et douce face.
Au droit jugier je me tien a la flour.

L'ENVOY

Royne d'amours, de douce contenance,
Qui tout passez en senz et en honnour,
Plus qu'a fueille vous faiz obeissance:
A droit jugier je me tien a la flour.[2]

The identification of the first suitor as Richard remains, and the complimentary nature of the description has been sufficiently pointed out.[3]

The second suitor, if identified as William of Hainaut, was certainly "of lower kinde" and had "served" Philippa longer—"always," according to John of Gaunt's statement (see p. 19 above).[4]

But the most interesting point of agreement between the poem and historic fact is in the case of the third suitor. Professor Emerson's efforts to establish half a year of courtship for Charles VI[5]

[1] Professor Kittredge says that the poem was written before, perhaps several years before, 1386 (*Mod. Phil.*, I, 4 f.).

[2] *Œuvres* (Société des Anciens Textes Français), IV, 260 f.

[3] It is of course not impossible that the ardent, impulsive boy of fourteen may have had a romantic affection for his cousin of twenty-one; but it is not necessary to suppose so. A court poet of Chaucer's intelligence, would have had the tact to assume this state of mind if he was complimenting the Princess.

[4] He begins to say that he loves her better than the first suitor; then changes to "Or atte leste I love hir as wel as ye" (ll. 451–52). This is interesting in view of the statement of the anonymous chronicler (see p. 20, n. 2, above) that William was in love with Philippa.

[5] *Mod. Phil.*, VIII, 58; and cf. Manly, *loc. cit.*, p. 281, n. 1.

are rendered needless by the fact that the text does not say that he had courted the formel half a year. It reads:

> Of long servyse avaunte I me no-thing
> But as possible is me to dye to-day
> For wo, as he that hath ben languisshyng
> Thise twenty winter, and wel happen may
> A man may serven bet and more to pay
> In half a yere, al-though hit were no more
> Than som man doth that hath served ful yore.
>
> *I ne say not this by me,*[1] for I ne can
> Do no servyse that may my lady plese;
> But I dar seyn I am hir trewest man,
> As to my dome, and feynest wolde hir ese;
> At shorte wordes, til that deth me sese,
> I wol ben hires, whether I wake or winke,
> And trewe in al that herte may bethinke [ll. 470–83].

The third suitor jeers at the idea of length of service as showing devotion—half a year will do as well as twenty. His figures are merely for illustration. But, he continues, the argument does not apply to himself, for he cannot do any service at all to please his lady; for all that, he is her most loyal lover, and will remain faithful until death. But why could he not serve her? If he represents John of Blois, obviously because he was in prison.[2]

If the known facts about the marriages discussed for Philippa in 1381 are in harmony with the descriptions in *The Parlement of Foules*,[3] the next question to be considered is, How does the

[1] Italics mine.

[2] As he and his brother were hostages, they were of course treated like gentlemen. John may have seen and had some acquaintance with Philippa—may even have been attracted to her and still unwilling to relinquish his allegiance to the King of France for her sake.

The match was not unsuitable for Philippa. The rival claimant to Brittany was married to King Richard's half-sister. Another half-sister, Joan Courtney, married at Easter, 1380, the Count of St. Pol, who had been captured in 1374 and had since that time been a prisoner in England. And this was a love match based upon acquaintance.

[3] Two lines may need explanation: The tercelet of the falcon (ll. 547 ff.) speaks of the first suitor as "worthieste of knighthode, and lengest hath used hit."

Richard was knighted in 1377. William of Hainaut was not knighted until he was twenty (at the siege of Dam, 1385). John of Blois was much older. His parents were married in 1337, and he was born between 1338 and 1345. He was at least forty years old in 1381. But he had been in prison since 1356; there is no evidence that he had been knighted then.

In the literal sense of the words, then, the lines fit; but I am inclined to think that they are a mere complimentary generalization.

In reply to Professor Manly's objection that it is absurd to apply such description to mere children, I should say that in Chaucer's time these boys in their teens were

historical situation of Philippa and her father explain the inconclusive ending of the poem? Politically speaking, Philippa was in danger of being jilted for a foreign princess. Yet Richard was so much the best match that she could not save her pride by immediately choosing one of the other suitors. In such a complicated and irritating position, the most delicate flattery would be the suggestion that, with due appreciation of the merits of the royal suitor, the princess was not yet ready to make up her mind. He might be pointed out by Nature and Reason; his claim might be strongly urged by the nobility; she could only ask for "respit"[1] and—in view of the extreme uncertainty of the outcome of Lancaster's schemes for his daughter[2]—her "choys al free."

In this interpretation the personal relationship of the royal cousins, Richard and Philippa, plays no part.[3] The poem is regarded merely as a court poet's balm for the hurt pride of the prince for whom on a more tragic occasion he wrote the *Book of the Duchess*.[4]

THE SATIRE

But what of the satire? One-seventh of the poem describes a mock parliament in which the common birds discuss, not love in general, not the formel's decision, but whether or not the first eagle shall marry another if the formel will not have him. And in this discussion every remark by one of these birds, with the striking exception of the turtle-dove, is unmercifully ridiculed[5] by the noble

regarded as men and played the parts of men. Henry IV had a son before he was sixteen, Edward III before he was seventeen. The Black Prince was sixteen at Crécy; John of Gaunt went to war at the age of ten. In Ipswich at this time boys were made citizens at the age of twelve (Mrs. Green, *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*, I, 184). The very Richard to whom Professor Manly thinks this description unsuited only three months later seems to have behaved like a man, in dealing with Wat Tyler's rebellion; but cf. Dr. Kriehn's "Studies in the Sources of the Social Revolt in 1381," in the *American Historical Review*, VII, 254 ff., 458 ff.

[1] The year is a part of the bird convention; it means until the next mating season.

[2] They all fell through, and she married the King of Portugal in 1387.

[3] In ll. 433 ff. of the poem the formel seems to express personal preference, or at least to be especially moved by the plea of the first eagle; but we know nothing of Philippa's attitude toward Richard. The formel's blush may be mere tribute to his charm.

[4] Why was Lancaster's younger brother, the Earl of Cambridge, asked to put through the negotiations for Richard's marriage with Anne when the senior uncle would naturally have been expected to look after his nephew's affairs? Was Lancaster's objection to the marriage so voiced that it was impossible or impolitic to ask him to undertake this duty, or did he refuse it?

[5] As every reader will prefer to see these speeches in their context, no detailed analysis of them is given here.

birds. What has this situation to do with the conventional *demande d'amours*, or with the analysis of lawful and lawless love?

The two questions to be answered are: Do the birds represent men? and, For whom was such a satire intended?

That the birds represent classes of men is made practically certain by the continual use of bird and beast allegory in all forms of medieval thinking. In England as early as 1330 the preacher Robert Holkot had allegorized as birds different classes of men.[1] There is frequent reference to allegorical political satire in the chronicles and elsewhere.[2] Langland used it; Gower used it in his *Tripartite Chronicle;* it appears in *Richard the Redeless;* Deschamps is full of it, and his *Fiction de l'aigle* (cf. p. 4 above), which cannot be much later than *The Parlement of Foules*, and for all we know may be a little earlier, uses birds to satirize classes as well as to represent individuals. In similar mood to Chaucer, if not imitative of the allegory of the *Parlement*, is the later political satire:

> The gees han mad a parlement,
> Toward the eron [Henry IV] are they went.[3]

On this basis, then, the "foules of ravyne" are the nobility (as in Holkot and commonly elsewhere), but identification of the classes of men ridiculed as the goose, duck, and cuckoo is less certain. A few points of characterization are, however, clearly pointed out. They are divided into three classes: Water fowl, seed fowl, and worm fowl, of which only the water fowl and worm fowl are ridiculed. The turtle who is "vantparlour" for the seed fowl is a modest bird whose views on love are treated with respect by the noble birds; but the water birds are fools to be laughed at, and the cuckoo is a plain villain, who is not laughed at but is reprimanded with bitter contempt. The views of the water birds are mere practical common sense, which is quite foreign, of course, to the ideas of courtly love; and the views of the worm fowl are that as long as they have what they want they do not care what the royal birds do. It is difficult to resist the suggestion that the water fowl represent the great merchants, whose fortunes were founded on the import and export

[1] *Super Libros Sapientie* (Reutlingen-Colmar, 1489), Lectio lxv *b*.

[2] See Taylor, *op. cit.*

[3] Wright, *Political Poems and Songs* (*Rolls, Series*), I, 365.

trade; the seed fowl, the simple country gentry, whose views naturally echo those of the lords with whom they are associated in the holding of land, and whose livelihood depends directly upon the earth; and the worm fowl, the citizenry, the working classes whose chief interest in life is so bitterly summed up by the merlin (ll. 610–16) and whose food consists of the casual and disgusting worm—whatever they can pick up.

Without pressing this point, however, we may proceed to the observation that if the poem is satirizing the great bourgeoisie and the "ribald" citizenry, it is satirizing the two classes of men whom John of Gaunt, more than any other great lord in England, had particular reason to hate.[1]

CONCLUSION

1. It is clear that the political allegory heretofore adduced to motivate the existence of the poem and to explain its meaning is not only historically unsubstantiated but if it were substantiated explains neither the girl's failure to choose among the suitors nor the extensive satire on the common birds.

2. The plans of John of Gaunt for the marriage of his daughter Philippa seem from the evidence to have taken such shape in the late winter of 1381 as to make the production of such a poem as *The Parlement of Foules* a compliment which would have been particularly grateful to him, and the special development of the situation in the poem offered a plausible interpretation of the collapse of the most desirable plan, which the proud Duke could hardly have failed to appreciate.[2]

This study was suggested to me many years ago by Professor Manly, who in expressing his disbelief in the Richard-Anne theory, observed that if a historical interpretation was needed it should

[1] See p. 17, n. 5, above. For vivid expression of the mob's hatred of him shown at the burning of the Savoy in 1381, cf. *Hist. Vit. & Regni Ric. II* (ed. Hearne, 1729), pp. 25 f.

[2] Without resting any part of the argument upon Chaucer's relation in general to John of Gaunt, I may point out here that through the position of his wife as lady-in-waiting to Constance of Castile, he had the best opportunity of knowing not merely court gossip but much of the attitude of the principals whom it concerned. Thus he was in a position peculiarly favorable for writing a complimentary poem. Furthermore, in May, 1381, John of Gaunt paid £51 8*s*. 2*d*. for the establishment of Elizabeth Chaucy in Barking Abbey. The hypothesis that she was Chaucer's daughter or sister suggests a particular motive for an occasional poem which thus found its reward soon after; but this of course cannot be proved.

be possible to find a situation that would fit better; for instance, a courtship of one of John of Gaunt's daughters. Without committing myself beyond the possibility of "Retraccioun" to belief in the necessity of any historical interpretation, I feel at present that the peculiar features of the poem are not self-explanatory as belonging to either a triple *demande d'amours* or a mere exposition of natural as opposed to illicit love. I am confident, moreover, that I have outlined a situation which, as far as the evidence goes, not only fits the poem but supplies an occasion which serves to interpret its unique structure and a patron from whom Chaucer, both logically and psychologically, might at that time have expected a reward for such a poetical compliment. In accordance with the principles of historical investigation, this hypothesis should be accepted until one that fits and interprets still better is produced.[1]

Edith Rickert

University of Chicago

[1] In another paper I hope to show that the structure and style of the poem, as well as the condition of the MSS, warrant the further hypothesis that the poem was begun in 1374—on the basis of astronomical interpretation of l. 117, May 12, 1374—and finished with an entirely changed conception adapted to the particular situation which arose in the winter of 1381.

THE PROBLEMS OF AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF *WYNNERE AND WASTOURE*

I. AUTHORSHIP

When in 1897 Professor Gollancz first edited *The Parlement of the Thre Ages* and *Wynnere and Wastoure*, for the Roxburghe Club, he suggested that the two were the work of one author. For this conclusion he gave seven reasons: (1) The poems have lines in common, and (2) passages in one are strongly reminiscent of passages in the other. (3) The general framework is the same. (4) Both use verbal forms in *-ande* as nouns. (5) Both show careless confusion in details. (6) "Tests of language and meter do not tell against the identity of authorship." (7) The general impression conveyed by the two pieces tells strongly in favor of the view. Kölbing in his review of Gollancz' edition accepted this conclusion, saying that the use of alliteration was practically the same in both poems.[1] In his second edition of the *Parlement*,[2] Professor Gollancz said: "No criteria gainsay the theory that would assign it [the *Parlement*] to the author of *Wynnere and Wastoure*."

If we look at the evidence for this opinion, however, we find it not strong. The similarities in phrasing and idea are not more remarkable than those which connect these poems with *Piers the Plowman* and *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*. As a test of authorship such similarities are valueless, as Mr. George Neilson's *reductio ad absurdum* has demonstrated. As to the third point, the framework is the vision as found in *Piers the Plowman* and many other Middle English poems. In regard to the fourth point, the use of forms in *-ande* as nouns is extraordinary, but only one instance is found in each poem, and in one of these the B-Manuscript of *Parlement* reads *make* instead of *makande*. The use is also found sporadically elsewhere, for example, in the reports of the Guilds, *to ye*

[1] *Englische Studien*, XXV, 273. He did note one difference between the two: *Parlement* has forty-eight lines using vowel alliteration, nine of which rhyme on the same vowel. In *Wynnere* only eight cases of vowel alliteration occur, of which one uses the same vowel.

[2] Oxford, 1915, p. 2 of Preface.

offrende;[1] in the York Plays, *to make oure offerand,*[2] *By-cause of wakand you unwarly,*[3] *Sende yhou som seand of þis;*[4] in *The Seven Sages, ofrand;*[5] in *Piers the Plowman, and is trusti of his tailende;*[6] and in *Sir Perceval, travellande*[7] (established by rhyme). In our case, the peculiarity is probably scribal because in the *Parlement* it is found only in Thornton's copy. The fifth point—careless confusion in details—would apply to many medieval poems, and the seventh—in regard to general impression—means nothing. *Wynnere* is so much more interesting than *Parlement* that "general impression" might be said to argue against identity of authorship. The similarity in the use of alliteration is only negative evidence; plenty of alliterative poems show the same uses.[8]

What of the language? Of course it is impossible to speak with certainty about the dialect of a poem which exists in only one copy because the scribe of that manuscript may have altered the dialectal forms of the original. We know this to have been done in many cases, for example, in certain manuscripts of *Piers the Plowman* and of Chaucer. Perhaps all that can be determined is whether or not the transmission of two given works is the same. If we find that two poems existing in a certain manuscript have not been copied from the same exemplar, or at some earlier point in the transmission have come from different sources, we learn at least that their presence together in the same manuscript has no significance in establishing authorship.[9]

Now a little study of the two poems shows a marked difference in one of the most noticeable criteria of dialect, verbal inflexion.

[1] E.E.T.S., Vol. 40, p. 107.

[2] Ed. L. T. Smith, p. 59, l. 99; p. 60, l. 138.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 281, l. 270. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 109, l. 235. [5] Ed. Campbell, l. 2656.

[6] B-text, VIII, 82. See Skeat's note in the Glossary of the E.E.T.S. edition.

[7] Camden Society, l. 1325.

[8] See K. Schumacher, *Studium über den Stabreim in der m.e. Alliterationsdichtung*, 1914, Summary, pp. 212–13.

[9] It seems to me necessary to make these obvious statements because there is still a strong tendency to regard poems which appear in the same manuscript as works of one author. Many examples could be cited, from the old days when all contents of the Exeter Book were thought to have been written by Cynewulf to the present time when the opinion is generally expressed that the four poems in manuscript Nero A X (*Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt, Pearl*, etc.) were written by one man. As a matter of fact, their presence in the same manuscript, written by the same hand, ought to make us suspicious of surface similarities.

Parlement has a fairly consistent series of forms of the type ordinarily called West Midland; that is, the first person singular present indicative ends in *-e* or - , the second and third singular in *-es, -ys, -is,* the plural in *-en, -yn;* the present participle appears only twice, once in *-ynge,* the other time in *-ande.*[1]

Wynnere, on the other hand, shows mixed forms. It has endings like those found in *Parlement,* but in addition it has another set. The second singular ends in *-este, -st* five times, in *-is, -es, -ys* six times. The third singular ends in *-eth, ethe, -ith* twelve times, in *-es, -is, -ys* twenty-six times. The plural ends once in *-eth,* once in *-ith,* a few times in *-es,* but mostly in *-e* or *-en.* Forms in *-th* appear also in the imperative (*dothe,* l. 220) and in the inflexion of the verb *have,* where *hathe* is used as plural and singular; *thou haste* also appears three times. The forms in *-este* appear in the preterite of auxiliaries (*scholdeste,* l. 258; *woldeste,* l. 375; *woldest,* l. 442), and of ordinary verbs (*madiste,* l. 264; *louediste,* l. 304). The present participle appears more often than in *Parlement,* three times in *-ynge,* twelve times in *-ande.*

With regard to the distribution of these forms, it should be noted that the *-st, -th* endings appear chiefly in the early part of the poem: *th* appears in ll. 3, 6, 7, 16. The first appearance of the third singular in *-es* is in l. 68. Up to l. 201 there are fifteen forms in *-th* and seventeen in *-es* or its variants. Similarly the first three appearances of the second singular are in *-este* (ll. 260, 264, 265), and the three *-ynge* forms appear in the first two hundred lines. One might perhaps infer from these facts that the manuscript before Robert Thornton, or some predecessor in the line of transmission, used the *-st, -th, -ynge* forms more extensively or even exclusively, and that the copyist at the beginning of his work copied it more literally but as he progressed became less attentive and used his own forms.[2]

[1] MS B shows four instances of the third singular in *-ith,* and one instance of the form *hath* apparently used as a plural. What the significance of this slight difference between MSS A and B may be is problematical. B may have been transcribed by a Southern or East Midland man at some time after it was copied from the ancestor of A, or these traces of Southern influence may have been in the ancestor of A. In any case they do not affect the fact that Robert Thornton's copy of the *Parlement* shows no such forms, whereas his copy of *Wynnere* has many of them.

[2] It is possible that a minute study of the language of the two poems would show other differences. Granting some alteration by scribes, however, one cannot trust greatly the criteria of difference between Northern and East Midland.

In any case it is certain that Robert Thornton did not add the East Midland or Southern forms. He was a northern man, and his ordinary practice seems to have been to alter the language of his originals in the direction of his own dialect.[1] Furthermore, as the author of *Wynnere* certainly knew London it is not improbable that the *-st, -th* endings, which are correct London forms, belong to the original draught of the poem.[2] Of course such judgments are merely possibilities; but it is to be noted that from different points of view the same conclusion is reached—that the original of *Wynnere* was more southern than that of *Parlement.*

II. DATE

In his first edition of *Parlement*, Professor Gollancz argued that the date of *Wynnere* was 1347 or early in 1348. In support of this date he used the references to the Order of the Garter, the Black Prince, heraldry, discontent with the Friars, the twenty-fifth year of Edward III, and "Scharshull"—and the failure to mention the Black Death.[3] In the second edition of *Parlement*, Professor Gollancz changed his date to "not much later than 1350,"[4] apparently because of a controversy with Mr. George Neilson which appeared in *The Athenaeum* for 1901. As far as I can make out, he chose the first date primarily because of the lack of reference to the Black Death, and the second because of the statement that the King had reigned twenty-five years, which would not be true until 1351. Certainly the last-named fact is sufficient to disqualify Mr. Gollancz' first date: in 1347 Edward III had been on the throne but twenty-one years. Let us look more closely, however, at Mr. Gollancz' evidence. The references to the Garter, the Black Prince, and the heraldic devices of the King give only a date *a quo.* Discontent with the Friars was voiced throughout the latter half

[1] Horstmann, *Alt.-engl. Legenden*, N.F., 1881, p. 454, speaking of Thornton's Lincoln manuscript, says: "Die ursprünglich in einem anderen Dialect abgefassten Gedichte sind in dem Yorkshire Dialect umschrieben."

[2] Probably the same remark applies if the author's reference to the West means some such locality as Staffordshire or Shropshire.

[3] I have not included the (doubtful) references to a famine followed by a great fire and to a drought because Mr. Gollancz finds no nearer dates than 1315–16, 1322, and 1325 for them.

[4] *Parlement*, 1915, p. 2.

of the fourteenth century. The one important piece of evidence is the reference to "Scharshull," which is as follows: Wastoure wishes that

> alle schent were those schalkes and Scharshull it wiste
> That saide I prikkede with powere his pese to distourbe [ll. 317–18].

Gollancz shows that Scharshull was Justice of the King's Bench in 1333, that he was dismissed in 1340 but restored to office in 1342, two years later was made Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and in 1350 was appointed Chief Justice of the King's Bench. He then says: "The reference in 'Wynnere and Wastoure' is evidently to Scharshull as Chief of the Exchequer. Wastoure's disregard of his capital, seeing that the taxes were paid on actual possessions, might well have disturbed the Chancellor of the Exchequer's peace of mind."[1] Mr. George Neilson has already answered this strange statement as follows: "A reference to a judge in connection with breach of the peace ('his pese to distourbe') cannot possibly indicate the baron of the Exchequer."[2] If that is not convincing, attention may be called to a fact not mentioned by Professor Gollancz: Scharshull was Baron of the Exchequer for only sixteen months, from July, 1344, to November, 1345, when he was removed to the Court of Common Pleas.[3] According to Mr. Gollancz' methods this fact would require dating the poem 1345. But that date would not agree with the reference to the twenty-fifth year of Edward III's reign (1351) or to the Order of the Garter, which was not in existence in 1345.[4] In truth Mr. Gollancz wishes to date the poem earlier than 1350 if possible so as to account for the failure to refer to the Black Death. To account for that, the date really ought to be 1348, for if it is put at 1350 the failure to mention the Black Death is surely much more extraordinary than it would be ten years later. But as the poet would not have referred to the "five and twenty winters" of the King's reign when there were only twenty-one or two, that date is impossible.

The deduction from this discussion is evidently that the *argumentum ex silentio* is a poor thing. It is no more necessary for us to

[1] *Parlement*, Roxburghe Club, p. xiii.
[2] *Huchown of the Awle Ryale*, Glasgow, 1902, p. 95, note.
[3] E. Foss, *Biographia juridica*, 1870, p. 610.
[4] See article by Sir Harris Nicolas in *Archaeologia*, XXXI, 104 ff.

explain the poet's failure to refer to the Black Death than to account for his failure to describe *Wastoure's* army in detail. Furthermore, the poem is incomplete; it may have mentioned the pestilence in the part now lost. The point from which to start then is the reference to the twenty-five years of the King's reign. This is a "round number," of course, and would be appropriate at any time after 1351. The next thing to consider is the reference to "Scharshull." As Professor Gollancz says, the exact meaning of the reference is not clear.[1] At any rate, Wastoure states that Scharshull "saide I prikkede with powere his pese to distourbe." Mr. Neilson's effort to connect the reference with a particular incident of the year 1358 is a failure.[2] Mr. Neilson shows that Scharshull was suspended from his office in 1357, but remarks a propos of the fact that a chronicler at his death in 1368 referred to him as *capitalis justiciarius*, "it can hardly be inferred that he had resumed his office."[3] If this were true it would be very apt for Neilson's date, 1358. But it is not. Reference to the *Patent* and *Close Rolls* shows that Scharshull was Chief Justice as late as 1361.[4] After 1361 he was on many commissions of the peace (especially in Staffordshire and Warwick) until December 24, 1366, when his patent was revoked.[5] If the mention of Scharshull refers to him as Chief Justice, therefore, it may have been made at any time up to 1361. But the poet, especially if he was a western man, may have had in mind some decision made by Scharshull when he was on commissions of *oyer and terminer* in Staffordshire. If so, the period is extended until the end of 1366.

There is one other piece of evidence to be considered. At the end of the poem, the King sends Wynnere to Rome and Wastoure to London. Then he says:

> & wayte to me þu Wynere if þu wilt wele chese
> when I wende appon werre my wyes to lede

[1] Roxburghe edition, p. xiii.

[2] *Huchown*, pp. 96–98. *Athenaeum*, 1901, Part 2, pp. 157, 254, 319, 351. His further statement that there is an allusion to the war in France "as still in progress" and hence that the date of the poem is before the signing of the Peace of Brétigny in 1360 is invalid because the poet does *not* state that the war is in progress.

[3] *Huchown*, p. 98, n. 2.

[4] *Cal. Pat. Roll*, 1358–61, p. 547; *Close Roll*, 1360–64, p. 113. For earlier references to him in that capacity see the indexes to the proper volumes of the Calendars.

[5] *Close Roll*, 1364–68, p. 289. For the earlier references see the indexes to the Calendars.

ffor at þe proude pales of parys þe riche
I thynk to do it in ded & dub þe to knyghte
And giff giftes full grete of golde & of s[ilver]
To ledis of my legyance þt lufen me in hert
& sithe kayren as I come with knyghtes þat me foloen
To þe kirke of Colayne þer þe kynges ligges.

This is certainly not evidence that the King was actually at war with France. Rather, it seems to indicate a period when the King was not active in war and could not use Wynnere for fighting, but was planning a great attack on France.[1] Such a state of affairs can be found during the truces at the end of the fifties or even after the signing of the Treaty of Brétigny in 1361. This treaty was not satisfactory to either party, and the French never carried out their part of it.[2] It might be supposed that as Edward by the Treaty of Brétigny gave up his claim on the throne of France he must have ceased quartering the arms of France with those of England on his coat-of-arms and that therefore the heraldic description in *Wynnere* would fix the date before 1361. But that is not true, as the effigies on his tomb and on that of the Black Prince still show the quartering. Hence even after 1361 it would be entirely proper to represent the King as meditating another great campaign in France.

From these considerations it is clear that any date between 1351 and 1366 would accord with the reference in *Wynnere*. The only check upon a late date is the reference to the twenty-five years of Edward III's reign. But it is doubtful how much weight can be given to that matter. The poem is an allegory, and though the King doubtless stands for Edward III, statements made about him need not be so exact as they would be in a direct account. Further, the number twenty-five is obviously a "round number," suitable any time after the twenty-fifth year, perhaps even to the fiftieth. The manner of phrasing—he "hase vs fosterde and fedde this fyve and twenty wyntere"—shows that it is not meant to give a definite date.

If merely the dating of *Wynnere* were concerned, the matter would not be worth so much discussion. But the entire chronology of

[1] So Gollancz refers it to the truce which followed the capture of Calais, September, 1347, to June, 1348 (Roxburghe, p. xiv).

[2] Longman, *Edward III*, pp. 61 ff.

alliterative poetry in the fourteenth century and our ideas of the growth of its technique are involved. If a date such as 1351, or indeed any date before 1361, is accepted, *Wynnere* is one of the earliest extant examples of the alliterative long line, unrhymed, in Middle English.[1] Of course if *Parlement* is, as Gollancz thinks, an earlier work of the same author, its position is still more notable. All this is very hard to believe. Professor Gollancz himself says: "One's first impression is that *The Parlement* is a sort of summary of longer poems—an epitome reminiscent of lines and passages in the chief alliterative poems of the second half of the fourteenth century."[2] In his note she calls attention to the resemblance of the first lines of *Parlement* to those of *Piers the Plowman*, and of the hunting scenes to episodes in *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*. As to the prologue, he says that because *Parlement* is earlier than *Piers*, "it follows that the famous opening lines of the latter poem, far from being echoed in the present poem, must have been a conventional prelude long before Langland impressed it with his genius."[3] Mr. Neilson gives a long list of resemblances between *Parlement* and *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*.[4]

Professor Manly reached practically the same conclusion as Gollancz. Both *Wynnere* and *Parlement* begin, he says, "in a manner suggestive of the beginning of *Piers the Plowman*, and both . . . . contain several lines closely resembling lines in the B-text of that poem. The lines in question seem, from their better relation to the context, to belong originally to *Piers the Plowman* and to have been copied from it by the other poems; if there were no evidence, these poems would, doubtless, be placed among those suggested by it; but there is other evidence [the reference to Scharshull]. . . . . The conclusion is apparently inevitable that the imitation is on the part of *Piers the Plowman*."[5]

The first lines of *Wynnere* must remind any reader of the beginning of *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*. That these lines are original in *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt* rather than in *Wynnere* seems probable because they are more natural and appropriate in the former.

[1] Gollancz, Roxburghe, p. xi; Wells, *Manual*, p. 241.

[2] Ed. 1915, p. 2 (Preface). [3] Roxburghe, p. xiv.

[4] *Huchown*, pp. 72–73. Some of them are of course insignificant.

[5] *Cambridge History*, II, 42–43.

In *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt* the poet starts with the siege of Troy, and passes to the colonization of the west by Trojan exiles, mentioning Eneas, Romulus, and Brutus. Then, he says, since Britain was established by Brutus, more extraordinary things (ferlyes) have happened than in any other country. This is probably a forecast of the strange adventure of the Green Knight, but before he can proceed to that the poet must mention Arthur, his court, and the Christmas celebration. With the setting thus established he introduces the Green Knight and begins the story. Every step of the introduction is a logical advance to a definite goal.

In *Wynnere*, on the other hand, the poet mentions Brutus and Britain, then the taking of Troy, and finally says,

> There hathe selcouthes bene sene in sere kynges tymes
> But never so many as nowe by the nyne dele.

But he proceeds from that to general comment on the decay of the time and the neglect of true poets, and finally falls asleep and dreams. His *selcouthes* connect with nothing that follows.

On comparison of the documents, Manly—and I think Gollancz also—felt that the scenes and lines were original where they were organic and imitated where they were inorganic. This judgment seems to be correct, but they disregarded it on account of Scharshull. Furthermore an early date for these poems would run counter to the opinion of Skeat as to the technical development of Middle English alliterative poetry. He says: "The law of progress in alliterative poetry is from lines cast in a loose mould to lines cast in a strict one; from lines with *two* alliterated letters to lines with *three*," etc.[1] In this respect *Wynnere* and *Parlement* are not primitive. Their verse is far more polished and effective than that of *William of Palerne* (before 1361) or *Joseph of Arimathie*.

Since, as we have seen, the time references in *Wynnere* indicate merely a period between 1351 and 1366, and since the parallelisms in it suggest even to people who believe in an early date imitation

[1] Preface to *Joseph of Arimathie*, p. x. Skeat's law, to be sure, is subject to exceptions; e.g., a person unfamiliar with recent pieces of alliterative verse might write an early type at a late date. Furthermore, the law may be incorrect, for it is based on only a few facts, chiefly the early dates of *William of Palerne* and of *Joseph of Arimathie*, which is in the Vernon manuscript, dated by Skeat "about 1370–80" (Preface to A-text of *Piers*, E.E.T.S., p. xv).

of *Piers* and *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*, the logical date would seem to be some time after 1361, the date of *Piers* A.[1]

As to *Parlement*, we have no evidence. Even if it should be by the author of *Wynnere*, it may have been years later than that work. Gollancz' argument for priority is as follows: "The 'Parlement' may well have been written at a somewhat earlier date than 'Winnere and Wastoure'; in this latter effort the poet shows himself rather more practiced in his art; his touch seems firmer, his thoughts more rapid and intense; maybe the theme was more congenial, but under any circumstances no great interval could have separated the poems."[2] Such argument hardly needs comment. *Timon of Athens*, *Pericles*, *Troilus and Cressida*, were not written at the beginning of Shakspere's career, nor were *Richard Feverel* and *The Egoist* produced at the end of Meredith's. So far as I can see, even if they were the work of one man, *Parlement* and *Wynnere* may have been separated from each other by forty years.

I have no desire to set up a hypothetical chronology like those which afflict students of Chaucer and Old English literature. But with several fixed dates, it seems to me that we can get some impression of the time order of a few early alliterative pieces. The following arrangement would not conflict with any facts or impressions of technical development: *William of Palerne*, 1350–60; *Piers* A, 1362; *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt* before *Wynnere*;[3] *Wynnere*, after *Piers* A but not later than 1366. *Parlement* is later than *Piers* and *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*, and there is no evidence for a date *ad quem*.

J. R. HULBERT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Any resemblances to *Wynnere* found in the B-text of *Piers* would then be regarded as the result of chance or imitation by the author of *Piers* B.

[2] Roxburghe, p. xi.

[3] There is no date *a quo* for *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt*. In the early volumes of the *New English Dictionary*, citations from *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt* were accompanied by the phrase "*c.* 1340," and from the other poems in the same MS. by "*c.* 1325." Later volumes however have "13 . . . . " I presume the reason for the change is that the editors found so many words appearing for the first time in these documents that they came to doubt their antiquity. Morris on the title page of his E.E.T.S. edition of *Gawayne and the Grene Knyȝt* estimated the date at about 1360. For another attempt to date the poem see *Modern Philology*, XIII, 136, n. 3. Wells gives the date "about 1370" without stating evidence.

RICHARD RAWLIDGE ON LONDON PLAYHOUSES

Among the obscure authors who have suffered in consequence of misquotation by reformers, few perhaps have been so consistently misrepresented as Richard Rawlidge. The writer of a brief and justifiable pamphlet setting forth the disadvantages to a commonwealth of immoderate drinking and other evils, he has been quoted by the zealous Prynne in such manner as to imply his bitter opposition to the theater and to pleasure in general. Through Prynne's attention his utterance has found its way, in garbled form, into the productions of Jeremy Collier and other antagonists of the stage, until many persons have been accustomed to look upon Rawlidge as a Puritan militant in the fight against the theater. Furthermore, scholars who have bothered themselves with the history of early playhouses in London have consulted Prynne's quotation rather than Rawlidge's original, and in consequence Rawlidge has been brought into undue prominence—sometimes almost scolded—by those who have been perplexed by what he apparently said. Miss Gildersleeve,[1] for instance, in endeavoring to assign an order to suppress the London theaters to the spring of 1582, writes as follows: "Moreover, Rawlidge's *Monster Lately Found Out*, published in 1628, in an account of the controversy states that it was soon after 1580 that the citizens expelled the players and 'quite pulled down and suppressed' the playhouses in the City"; and further on (p. 219) she cites his production along with such works as the *Refutation* of Heywood's *Apology* and the *Shorte Treatise against Stage-Playes* as aiding in renewing "the literary onslaught which culminated in Prynne's *Histriomastix*." More recently, to limit myself to the citation of another excellent book, so careful a scholar as Professor J. Q. Adams states[2] that "Richard Reulidge" wrote that "soon after 1580" the playhouses were suppressed in London, and then proceeds to quote Prynne instead of the original. Again, on discovering that the list of playhouses suppressed offers considerable

[1] *Government Regulation of Elizabethan Drama*, p. 163.

[2] *Shakespearean Playhouses*, p. 8.

difficulties, he asserts[1] that "the whole passage written by a Puritan after the lapse of nearly half a century, is open to grave suspicion, especially in its details."

Before quoting Rawlidge's own words, which are indeed sufficiently vague and perplexing, let us hasten to say in these times of national prohibition that they are apparently not the result of overmuch zeal and that the man should not be stigmatized as a Puritan. Unquestionably he entertained puritanic tendencies, but his pamphlet contains a good deal more liberality and common sense than is found in numerous documents recently composed by persons entertaining similar tendencies. He does not give the impression that he is hostile to the drama as drama; he is not at all concerned primarily with the suppression of the playhouses; his reference to the theater and its evils is purely incidental in a production that deals with other subjects. Furthermore, he approves heartily of the old sports on the Sabbath, attributing the enormous number of "blind" alehouses and other objectionable resorts to the suppression, during the reign of James I, of the old-fashioned pastimes on Sunday. Instead of being a moral agitator or professional reformer, he is a man of some modesty, admitting that he has no real right to meddle with the making of books—the business of poets and scholars instead of "a mechanicall man such a one as I am."

To this honest protest on the part of a good citizen against real evils of the period was apparently[2] given the title *A Monster Lately Found Out and Discovered, or the Scourging of Tiplers.* Although "tipling" is the author's principal subject, the work touches upon the "three most grosse and open Sunnedaring vices hourely committed within the walls and precincts of this Cittie." These the author carefully lists as follows:

First, Drunkennesse, needlesse drinking, and Gaming permitted in Alehouses, and Typling houses without restraint.

Secondly, Swearing, Lying, and open blaspeming the holy name of God without Checke, or controwle.

[1] *Shakespearean Playhouses* p. 310, note.

[2] So Prynne quotes the title (*Histriomastix*, p. 491), assigning the work to the year 1628. The copy of Rawlidge's pamphlet in the British Museum has no title-page. A former owner has written on a fly-leaf: "A Monster late found out and discovered, a discourse against Tipling Houses of the Citie of London by Richard Rawlidge 1606."

Thirdly, Ingrossing, Regrading, and forestalling the Marketts, so that hardly can any Victualls be bought, but at the third, or second hand at least.

Significant is the omission of playhouses from these three "raigning sinnes."

Rawlidge is not clamoring for the making of new laws but asking for the enforcing of old ones. Whereas, he writes, there are only 122 churches in the city and Liberties, there are "I dare say thirty hundred Ale-houses, Typling-houses, Tobacco-shops, &c. in London and the skirts thereof." These should be reduced to at least the number of churches. To do this "there needes neither mechanicall pollicies, nor new Sessions of Parliament, for all the laws be well and good already, there lacks nothing but execution."

Now for the casual reference to the theaters. In a passage of sermon-like eloquence, the opening of which sounds as if it might possibly be a "mechanicall" man's echo of a certain tribute in *Richard II*, he says:

This so renowned, so famous a Place, this peerelesse Citty, this *London*, hath within the memory of man lost much of hir pristine lustre, and renowne, by being pestered and filled with many great and crying sinnes, which were first hatched, and are ever since fostered and maintained, in Play-houses, Ale-houses, Bawdy-houses, Dicing-houses, otherwise stiled Ordinaries, of which, which are the most Reseptacles of all manner of baseness and ludenesse, is hard to be distinguisht, for all of them enterteined men and women of all sorts, come who would if they brought money with them: which houses of such Receipt flourish and keepe a great quoile in this famous Citty (the more is the shame) at this day: many a young Gentleman, and prodigall Citizen, being stript daily both out of lands, money, and wares, in these Dicing, Tipling, and Gaming houses, by Cheaters, Conny-catchers, and Shifters, who in the habits of Gentlemen (being indeede nothing lesse) are there harboured. All which houses, and traps for Gentlemen, and others, of such Receipt, were formerly taken notice of by many Citizens, and well disposed graue Gentlemen, who saw, and well perceiued the many inconveniences, and great Damage, that would ensue vpon the long sufferance of the same, not only to particular persons, but that it would also bee a great disparagement to the Governours, and a dishonour to the Government of this honourable Citty, if some order were not speedily taken for the suppressing of common houses for Enterludes, and Dicing, and Carding, &c. within the Citty, and Liberties thereof: wherevpon some of the pious Magistrates made humble suit to the late Queene *Elizabeth* of ever-living memorie, and her privy covnsaile, and obteined leaue from her Maiesty to thrust those Players out of the Citty, and to pull downe the Dicing houses: which

accordingly was affected, and the Play-houses in *Gracious Street, Bishops-gate-street*, nigh *Paules*, that on *Ludgate* hill, the *White-Friars* were put downe, and other lewd houses quite supprest within the Liberties, by the care of those religious Senators: for they did their best to remoue all disorders out of their Citties Liberties; and surely had all their successors followed their worthy stepps, sinne would not at this day haue been so powerful, and raigning as it is [pp. 2–3].

Before commenting on the passage, let us get before us Prynne's "verbatim" quotation of the words above. On page 491 of *Histriomastix* he writes:

The Magistrates of the Citty of London, as M. Iohn Field records, obteined from Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory, about the yeere 1580. that all Heathenish Playes and Enterludes should be banished upon Sabbath dayes; and not long after[1] many godly Cittizens, and wel-disposed Gentlemen of London, considering that Play-houses and Dicing-houses, were traps for yong Gentlemen and others; and perceiving the many inconveniences, and great damage that would ensue upon the long suffring of the same, not onely to particular persons, but to the whole Citty; and that it would also be a great disparagment unto the Governours, and a dishonour to the government of this honourable Citty, if they should any longer continue; acquainted some pious Magistrates therewith, desiring them to take some speedy course for the suppression of common Play-houses and Dicing-houses within the Citty of London and Liberties thereof. Who thereupon made humble suite to Queen Elizabeth and her Privy Councell, and obtained leave from her Maiesty to thrust the Players out of the Citty, and pull downe all Play-houses and Dicing-houses within their Liberties: which accordingly was effected: and the Play-houses in Gracious-street, Bishops-gate-street, that nigh Pauls, that on Ludgate-hill, and the White-Friers, were quite put downe and suppressed by the care of these religious Senators.

A reading of the passages above will reveal the fact that, unless Prynne is quoting from an edition of *A Monster Lately Found Out* other than that in the British Museum, he has misrepresented Rawlidge, for the latter says nothing about playhouses being put down "not long after" about 1580; consequently the passage is too vague and indefinite to be used, as has frequently been done, for dating certain legislative acts against the stage or showing that certain inn-yards "nigh Paules," in the Whitefriars, and elsewhere

[1] At this point Prynne refers the reader to Rawlidge, "where this is verbatim related."

were used by players at an early date.[1] As a matter of fact, if we believe—what is at least doubtful—that Rawlidge had in mind theaters only when he specified the particular "Play-houses" suppressed and if we are justified in attempting to restrict the passage to refer to any one act of legislation or any specific attack on the stage, then there is most reason for thinking that he is referring to the putting down of the theaters which took place apparently[2] in 1580 rather than to the suppression vaguely referred to by Fleetwood[3] as taking place in 1584 or the stringent order of the Privy Council[4] in 1597. The reason for such a statement is that Rawlidge implies that gamesters and actors suffered from simultaneous legislation during a reform wave. In 1580 there was apparently launched a hot fight against gamblers and gambling-houses,[5] though I do not know to what extent the City succeeded in ridding itself of the evil.

A comparison of the quotations above will also show that Prynne in the fervor of his hatred against the stage has, by substituting "the Players" for "those Players" and by certain other small alterations and by slight omissions, given the impression that Rawlidge is

[1] Cf., for example, Mr. Harold Child's remarkable interpretation of the passage in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, 282.

[2] On the subject of this 1580 order and the bitter fight against the theater during 1580–82, see Mrs. Stopes in Vol. IV (Supplement) to Furnivall's edition of Harrison's *Description of England*, pp. 320, note, 320–22; Miss Gildersleeve's *Regulation of Elizabethan Drama*, pp. 160–64; E. K. Chambers in Malone Society *Collections*, Vol. I, Part 2, pp. 168–69; Graves in *Studies in Philology*, XIV, 90–94. Mrs. Stopes (p. 320, note) states that in 1580 the Common Council passed an order to pull down the London playhouses; and Chambers (Malone Soc. *Collections*, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 46), commenting on the Lord Mayor's petition (April 12, 1580) to the Privy Council, says that the appeal was effectual, "as the Privy Council ordered the Middlesex and Surrey Justices to suppress plays by letters of April 17 and May 13 respectively." Miss Gildersleeve (p. 161) says that this legislation was due solely to the plague, but the plague was never serious in London during 1580.

[3] Gildersleeve, p. 169; Malone Soc. *Collections*, Vol. I, Part 2, pp. 165–66.

[4] Gildersleeve, pp. 187–88; Malone Soc. *Coll.*, Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 76–80.

[5] On September 5, 1580, Sir James Craft wrote regarding a "close alley," the completion of which had been forbidden by the Lord Mayor. On September 13, the Mayor replied that he had "stayed" the building for various reasons and that it had been thought desirable not only to stay other bowling alleys of a similar nature where "dicing, carding, and table-play" were held, but also to call in question the licenses already granted to places of the sort. Mrs. Stopes (Harrison, *Desc. of Eng.*, ed. Furnivall, IV, 321) cites a London regulation dated September 17, 1580: "A precept for a true certificate [a return] of all common Bowling Allies and Dysinge and carding houses that be in London, to thende, speedie reformacion maie be taken for the suppressinge of the same." On September 24, the Lord Mayor wrote to the Privy Council bringing the dangers of bowling alleys to their notice and "requesting power to suppress all such bowling alleys, nothwithstanding the Queen's licence granted for the same" (Overall and Overall, *Analytical Index to Remembrancia*, pp. 164–65).

rejoicing primarily at the expulsion of the actors from London and the suppression of the theaters. A careful reading of what Rawlidge actually writes, however, vague as his words are, makes it pretty clear that by "those Players" he meant primarily the gamblers of the period and that he was opposed to theaters, not because of any scruples against the drama, but because they were used as effective resorts by the gamesters and sharpers of the time.

Indeed, it may be of interest in this connection to know that an old champion of the stage has argued that Rawlidge was referring solely to gaming-houses when he spoke of putting down "play-houses" in Whitefriars and elsewhere. In his *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* Jeremy Collier used Rawlidge without consulting the original,[1] introducing the passage with the words, "About the Year 1580, there was a Petition made to Queen *Elizabeth* for suppressing Play-Houses." In a marginal note he refers the reader to Rawlidge's pamphlet, but he is obviously quoting from Prynne, whom he follows inaccurately. Collier's bit of carelessness did not escape the eyes of his opponents, for the author of *A Defence of Dramatick Poetry* (1698) at once brought him to task for citing an authority whose work could not be located, criticized the vagueness of the quotation, and suggested that the mysterious author might be referring to the suppression of gaming-houses instead of theaters. "But," he writes, "where *Play-houses* and *Dice-houses* are so suspiciously joyn'd together by this unknown Author, what if these *Play-houses* should prove but *Gaming-houses* at least; it looks very shrewdly that way, all circumstances consider'd" (p. 11). In the next year this explanation was accepted by the author of *The Stage Acquitted* (p. 43). In the meantime the writer of *The Stage Condemn'd* (1698) had rushed to Collier's assistance, admitting that whereas "Mr. Collier has been somewhat defective in his Quotation here," still Rawlidge and his *Monster* really existed once as proved by "Mr. Prin's" use of them. Then with the humorous looseness characteristic of many writers of zealous documents he proves his point by misquoting both Prynne and Rawlidge: "Our Author may be pleased to know, that *Rawlidge* says in the same place, 'That all the Play-houses within the City

[1] Cf. third edition, pp. 242–43.

were Pull'd down, by Order of Her Majesty and Council upon this Petition, *viz.* One in *Grace-church-street*, one in *Bishops-Gate-Street*, one near Pauls, one on *Ludgate-Hill*, and one in *White-Friers*' " (pp. 110–11).

If the author of *A Defence of Dramatick Poetry* could have seen Rawlidge's original instead of Collier's garbled version of Prynne's inaccurate quotation, he would perhaps have believed more strongly than ever that gaming-houses were meant by the "suspicious joining" of "Play-houses and Dice-houses." Were it not for the absence in seventeenth-century English of instances of the use of the word *playhouse* in the sense of *gambling-house*, and had not Rawlidge employed the expression "houses for Enterludes" in the course of his discussion, we might accept the explanation offered by this old opponent of Collier and believe that Rawlidge was using the term "Play-house" to distinguish gambling-houses other than "Dicing-houses, otherwise stiled Ordinaries," especially since he makes such a distinction in the expression "these Dicing, Tipling, and Gaming houses." Yet in spite of what has just been said, I am not convinced that the author of *A Defence of Dramatick Poetry* was entirely wrong. It is at least possible that Rawlidge might have confused gambling-houses and theaters when, writing loosely and vaguely, he specified that certain worthy citizens obtained Queen Elizabeth's permission "to thrust those Players out of the Citty, and to pull downe the Dicing-houses: which accordingly was affected, and the Play-houses in *Gracious-Street*, *Bishops-gate-street*, nigh *Paules*, that on *Ludgate* hill, the *White-Friars* were put downe, and other lewd houses quite supprest within the Liberties."

Just what does the passage mean, and why was Prynne apparently so careful to insert the "that" before "nigh Paules" and the "and" before "the White-Friars"? I have at least directed the attention of those who would use the passage to the original rather than to Prynne's interpretation of it, and have shown, I hope, that whereas Rawlidge may be censured perhaps for writing very vague English, it is not fair to classify him as one of those actively engaged in the suppression of the theaters.

THORNTON S. GRAVES

TRINITY COLLEGE, NORTH CAROLINA

LONGFELLOW'S "NATURE"

Among the ideas and studies for literary composition in Southey's *Common-place Book* (Fourth Series, p. 48) is the following epitaph:

> As careful nurses to the bed do lay
> Their children which too long would wanton play,
> So to prevent all my ensuing crimes
> Nature my nurse laid me to bed betimes.

This is described as an epitaph found "in some part of Yorkshire." There is evidently here the basis for a sonnet; but I do not know that Southey ever used the idea. The lines, however, have such a marked similarity to Longfellow's sonnet "Nature" that it would seem that he, presumably finding the suggestion going to waste in the *Common-place Book*, made it the basis for his poem:

> As a fond mother, when the day is o'er,
> Leads by the hand her little child to bed,
> Half willing, half reluctant to be led,
> And leave his broken playthings on the floor,
> Still gazing at them through the open door,
> Nor wholly reassured and comforted
> By promises of others in their stead,
> Which, though more splendid, may not please him more;
> So Nature deals with us, and takes away
> Our playthings one by one, and by the hand
> Leads us to rest so gently, that we go
> Scarce knowing if we wish to go or stay,
> Being too full of sleep to understand
> How far the unknown transcends the what we know.

JOHN D. REA

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE GENESIS OF SPENSER'S QUEEN OF FAERIE

Spenser's selection of the figure of a fairy queen to symbolize the glory pursued by the knights and humanists of the Renaissance—the idealism of the new England under Elizabeth—was for the period an anomalous one. Classic literature, on which most of the literature of the Renaissance was being modeled, has nothing nearer than goddesses like Venus protecting heroes like Aeneas, while Ariosto's epic, which Spenser was imitating and which was typical of the Italian influence in courtly poetry, offers little in the pictures of enchantresses with their power over the lives of heroes to explain the fairy queen of Spenser. Further, the attack of Ascham's *Schole-master* on Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, through which the fairy queens of romance were probably best known to Elizabethans, may be taken as typical of the attitude of the learned to Arthurian romance in England just before Spenser wrote. To most humanists no doubt, as to Harvey in 1580, the "Faerie Queene" was the "Eluish Queene," in tales of whom "*Hobgoblin* [would] runne away with the Garland from *Apollo*."[1] How then did Spenser come to adopt the Fairy Queen as the head of ancient chivalry, substitute her court and knights for the Round Table of Arthur, and make Arthur merely the chief figure in her realm? My belief is that his plan was partly influenced, as has been suggested more than once,[2] by the entertainment at Kenilworth in 1575, but more significantly by the complementary entertainment at Woodstock in the same year.

In the entertainment at Kenilworth,[3] Leicester made his appeal to Elizabeth's known love of things English, and in all probability to a growing national sentiment as well. Those who devised his

[1] "Three Letters," in *Works of Harvey* (ed. Grosart), I, 95.

[2] Warton (*Observations on the Fairy Queen* [1807], I, 39–45) considered the "Ladyes of the Lake" repairing to Eliza in the April Eclogue of the *Shepheardes Calender* a reference to the Kenilworth performance and indicative of the possible influence of pageants on Spenser's fairies. Greenlaw in an interesting study of the conventions of "Spenser's Fairy Mythology" in *Studies in Philology*, XV, 105 ff., thinks that the entertainment may have suggested a number of features of the *Faerie Queene*.

[3] Described in Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures at Kenelworth Castle* and Laneham's *Letter*. References to the first are to Cunliffe's edition of Gascoigne's *Works*, Vol. II. References to the second are to Furnivall's edition.

"shews" turned to account the romance of English history. The chief of them, Ferrers and Gascoigne, belonged to the school that produced the *Mirror for Magistrates* and *Gorboduc*, both of which use in poetic form events of English history. Even the folk diversions provided for Elizabeth at Kenilworth included a morris with Maid Marian, the associate of Robin Hood as national hero of the folk, and a Hox Tuesday play from Coventry, said to represent the courage of English women as contributing to the defeat of the invading Danes in the days of Ethelred. The popular and the romantic elements met in the ballad which was to have been sung by an "auncient minstrell" dealing with the acts of the most glorious figure of England's past, Arthur, whose Round Table in the days of Leicester had passed to organizations of archers among the folk.[1]

This national sentiment Leicester was utilizing for his own purposes. The diversions at Kenilworth were arranged to suggest that the lord of the castle was of royal English ancestry and particularly that he was Arthur's heir. The ancient foundation of Kenilworth and Arthur's abode there were stressed; reference was made to the tenure of Roger Mortimer,

> who first begun,
> (As *Arthures* heire) to keepe the table round;[2]

and above all the fairy queen as the Lady of the Lake and protectress of Arthur was represented as abiding with her nymphs in the lake at Kenilworth. Indeed it was through the use of *genii locorum* that the greatest emphasis was given to the idea that at Kenilworth the traditions of the golden age of England were still alive. The giant trumpeters on the wall "ment, that in the daies and Reigne of K. *Arthure*, men were of that stature." Genii of the woods were Sylvester, a savage man clad in ivy, who addressed Elizabeth on her return from hunting; his son Audax, clothed in moss; and Silvanus, god of the woods. As the Queen entered the castle the Lady of the Lake with her two "nymphs" came over the water, promising Elizabeth such love as she had given Arthur and yielding "the Lake, the Lodge, the Lord" to the royal command.[3]

[1] Brydges, *British Bibliographer*, I, 125 ff. For the morris of the folk bridal, the Hox Tuesday play, and the ballad, see Laneham, pp. 20–32, 36–43.

[2] For Mortimer's Round Table see Ellison, *Early Romantic Drama at the English Court*, p. 25; and Warton, *Observations on the Fairy Queen*, I, 41, note, 63, note.

[3] Gascoigne, *Works*, II, 92 ff. Giants as ancient inhabitants of sites of cities had been carried in many a civic pageant in which the glorious past was celebrated by enthusiastic

Leicester overshot his mark in glorifying himself. Though each *genius loci* surrendered to Elizabeth and flattered her with the usual fulsome extravagance, she seems to have resented the implied glorification of her subject Leicester. Possibly she recalled the tradition that Arthur was to come from his abode with the Lady of the Lake or from the other world to rule England again. Laneham records that upon the Queen's entrance to the castle when the Lady of the Lake made tender of her domain, "It pleozed her highness too thank this Lady, & too ad withall, 'we had thought indéed the Lake had been oours, and doo you call it yourz noow? Wel, we will héerin common more with yoo héerafter'" (p. 7). Leicester was obtuse apparently. Futile attempts were made for several days to present Gascoigne's masque urging Elizabeth's marriage to Leicester. Gascoigne could not attribute the failure "to any other thing, then to lack of opportunitie and seasonable weather" (p. 120), but the Queen probably deliberately avoided hearing the masque. She finally left Kenilworth suddenly.

The devices and speeches at Kenilworth were echoed in many details of the entertainment presented before Elizabeth shortly afterward at Woodstock[1]—for example, the use of Sibylla, the transformation of a man into an oak, with the voice issuing from the tree, the presence of a fairy queen, and particularly the tale and play dealing with the royal marriage. The performance at Woodstock seems to have been intended to offset that at Kenilworth,[2] whether it was inspired by hostility to Leicester or designed to restore him to the Queen's favor through evidence of a more self-effacing spirit. Another note was dominant, that of the willing service and sacrifice of Elizabeth's subjects without hope of reward, and in the dramatization of "Hemetes' Tale," which was "as well thought of, as anye thing euer done before her Maiestie, not onely of her, but of the rest" (p. 102), the good of the country was placed before the personal inclination of its princess in the matter of marriage.

citizens (Withington, *English Pageantry*, pp. 50 ff.). Apparently as spirits of wood or mount, wild men, or woodwose, appeared in connection with Henry VIII's pageants in which romantic mounts with caves and forests were represented (*Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, II, 1494–1502). See also Boas, *University Drama*, p. 161, and Withington, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–77, for other records of such figures in pageantry.

[1] Under the title "The Queenes Majesties Entertainment at Woodstocke" Cunliffe reprints in *PMLA*, XXVI (1911), 92 ff., Cadman's volume of 1585 dealing with the entertainment.

[2] Cunliffe, *PMLA*, XXVI, 130–31.

The fairy motive was expanded at Woodstock for the flattery of the Queen with notable success. An arbor was formed of branches on a marvelous mount made round an oak, with a hollow chamber or cave beneath, from which music issued (p. 98). This "walke" of the Fairy Queen was the scene of an elaborate banquet to Elizabeth. The crescent-shaped table mentioned was, I presume, for the royal Cynthia, and the round table, with its chair of crimson satin embroidered with pictures of trees and beasts, for the Fairy Queen. Any traditions which associated beings of the other world with the elvish, the dark, or the uncouth were disregarded. Love, said the Fairy Queen to Elizabeth,

> hath caused me to transforme my face,
> and in your hue to come before your eyne,
> now white, then blacke, your frende the fayery Queene.

She arrived at the bower "drawen with 6. children in a waggon of state: the Boies brauely attired, & her selfe very costly apparrelled, whose present shew might wel argue her immortality." That this splendor was directly turned to the flattery of Elizabeth was indicated in the entertainments at Quarrendon,[1] where the Woodstock show was pretty clearly described:

> The place and persons were so fitlie shuted:
> For who a Prince can better entertaine
> Than can a Prince, or else a prince's vaine? [p. 456].

Yet the whole conception of the Fairy Queen at Woodstock was appropriate to English fairy tradition—to which belonged the mound, the cave,[2] the table of turf, the round table,[3] the gifts, and even the royal pomp. She and her entourage were clothed in the splendor which the folk fancy in its lordliest flights gave to the other world and which appeared in the picture of the fairy court in the early

[1] The "Speeches" at Quarrendon, 1592, are to be found in Nichol's *Progresses of Elizabeth* (1823), III, 193–213, and in *Works of Lyly* (ed. Bond), I, 453–70. References are to Lyly's *Works*. Cunliffe quotes the speeches in part in discussing their relation to the entertainment at Woodstock.

[2] Scot, *Discovery of Witchcraft* (ed. Nicholson), p. 510: Fairies "do principally inhabit the Mountains, and Caverns of the Earth, whose nature is to make strange Apparitions on the Earth." See also the *Daemonology* of James I, Book iii, chap. v, for a reference to the belief of witches that "they haue bene transported with the *Phairie*" before a "faire Queene" in a hill that opened. But the mount with the cave was one of the chief romantic devices of earlier Tudor pageants (*Mod. Phil.*, XIV, 470–71; Feuillerat, *Revels Edward and Mary*, pp. 3, 6, 7, 8, 255; and Withington, *op. cit.*, pp. 192–93) as well as part of the popular conception of the fairy abode.

[3] For traditions of the Round Table and its connection with the world of magic, see Mott, *PMLA*, XX (1905), 231–64, and Brown, Harvard *Studies and Notes*, VII, 183–205.

lay of *Sir Orfeo*. In the dramatization of the tale of Hemetes, the Fairy Queen served as a guiding spirit, belonging not to the region of the Indus, the home of the mortal dramatis personae, but to the land which those wanderers sought—ruled by a "Lady in whom inhabiteth the most vertue, Learning, and beauty, that euer yet was in creature" (p. 96).

The fairy lore of royal progress and of court masque and play was probably launched at Woodstock on its successful career. The Fairy Queen with her "nymphs" appeared before Elizabeth at Norwich in 1578[1] with speeches and dances prepared by Churchyard, and fairies figured again and again in masques and plays of the succeeding decades, especially in the nineties. The device at Woodstock may have suggested the Fairy Queen who with her nymphs danced before Elizabeth at Elvetham in 1591, presenting a garland with an address to the Queen.[2] The Old Knight's Tale of the Quarrendon "Speeches" in 1592 presumably describes the Woodstock performance.

One feature of the banqueting bower at Woodstock may have a relation to Spenser's allegorical poem in a quite different fashion. The wall was hung with a "Number of fine Pictures with posies of the Noble or men of great credite." The "Allegories," says the writer, "are hard to be vnderstood, without some knowledge of the inuentors." The "Speeches" at Quarrendon declared seventeen years later the interest with which this personal allegory was received:

> The fayrie Queene the fayrest Queene saluted
> . . . . . .
> Of all the pleasures there, among the rest,
> (The rest were justes and feates of Armed Knightes),
> Within hir bower she biddes her to a feast,
> Which with enchaunted pictures trim she dightes,
> And on them woordes of highe intention writes:
> . . . . . .
> Manie there were that could no more but vewe them,
> Many that ouer curious nearer pride.
> Manie would conster needes that neuer knewe them,
> Som lookt, som lyked, som questioned, some eyed,
> One asked them too who should not be denied.

[1] Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth* (1st ed.), II, 84–87.
[2] *Works of Lyly* (ed. Bond), I, 449–50.

Elizabeth, according to the writer who describes the entertainment at Woodstock, was so pleased with the day's diversions that she ordered the whole to be delivered to her in writing, used the help of the devisors to decipher the meaning, and, her curiosity satisfied, had "often in speech some part hereof with mirth at the remembrance" (p. 103).

Spenser's patriotism, his interest in the ancient English poets, and his love of allegory and romance were such as to make the entertainments at Kenilworth and Woodstock with their mixture of historical, mythological, and allegorical elements appeal to him from various angles. Indeed parallels can be found in them for many romantic elements of the *Faerie Queene*, though most of the parallels are commonplaces of romance. The Fairy Queen of Woodstock, with the feast in her bower preceded by the tourney of knights, may have suggested the conception of a great festival of the Fairy Queen and the gathering of knights for feats of arms at her court as a substitute for Arthur's. But what seems more certain is that we have here support for the theory that Arthur in Spenser's allegory was intended to represent Leicester.[1] Perhaps Spenser, coming into the service of Leicester, utilized the devices of the entertainment at Woodstock by flattering Elizabeth directly in the figure of the Fairy Queen as the symbol of national glory, and carried still further the idea of the entertainment at Kenilworth by representing Leicester in the figure of Arthur as the flower of chivalry in the service of the Fairy Queen, led on by a dream of union with her. The effect at Woodstock would be countered by Spenser's picture of Leicester as the "brave knight, perfected" in all the virtues, the succor and stay of other knights, and the ornament of the kingdom of the Fairy Queen. Spenser may have modified the plan of an epic already conceived, or from the plan for an occasional piece he may have been swept out by the romantic and historical materials with which he was dealing into his idea for a national epic that would embody in "allegories" at once the glorious traditions of the past and the splendor of contemporary England.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO CHARLES READ BASKERVILL

[1] See Kitchin, *Faery Queene*, Book I, p. xv, note (Holinshed's account of a representation of Arthur to flatter Leicester), and Oxford *Spenser*, pp. li–liii.

ON THE DATE OF *THE OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE*

In Mr. Henry Barrett Hinckley's suggestive argument for the earlier date of *The Owl and the Nightingale*[1] he says, "But the reading of the Cotton MS alone should have warned us against this conclusion since the verb *under-wat* has the meaning of a present tense and shows that the scribe understood that Henry was still living when the prayer was offered." The evidence from the C reading *under-wat* has some extremely doubtful features. In the first place, the textual evidence is at least as strong against the correctness of the C reading as for it. It is a priori just as likely that the C scribe here should have mistaken a ȝ in his original for a ƿ as that the J scribe in writing *under-yat* mistook a ƿ for a ȝ. (In line 1469 the C scribe mistook ƿ for ȝ, writing *ȝif* for *wif*.) Moreover, Breier[2] on a fresh examination of the MSS declares for *under-*þ*at* as the reading in C 1091, assuming that the scribe has mistaken ȝ for þ, though it must be admitted that he might equally well have taken ƿ for þ, as he did in 187.

But even if we accept *under-wat*, Mr. Hinckley's contention that it is a present tense rests upon the insecure assumption that the word is a compound of the preterit-present verb *witan*, *wāt*. Breier[3] points out that Bradley-Stratmann's sole citation for the ME compound is this passage. It is usually assumed that the word is *underwīten*, in which case *under-wāt* is preterit after all, not preterit-present. In a matter so important as this, other evidence should be furnished not merely for the existence of *underwīten*, but for a preterit-present *underwāt*.

Whether we read *under-wat* or *under-yat*, there is well-nigh conclusive evidence that it is a past tense. And the same evidence points strongly to *under-ȝat* as the original. Close attention to the highly dramatic nature of the debate at this point shows that in 1091,

> þat under-wat (yat) þe king Henri,

the nightingale is turning against the owl her own statement in 1055:

> þe louerd þat sone under-ȝat.

[1] *Modern Philology*, XVII, 252.

[2] *Eule und Nachtigal*, Halle, 1910, p. 161.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

There the owl, after asserting that the nightingale had misled the lady to commit sin, says, "The lord at once discovered this [*þat* in unemphatic position] and laid a snare to catch you." The nightingale replies with great skill (cf. 1067–74) that the apparent triumph of this lord was really his ignominious defeat: "His own disgrace was brought about by his treatment of me,—that King Henry discovered and punished." Here the emphatic position of *þat* and *king Henri* gives the retort a peculiar a fortiori force: "*his* act was discovered by King Henry himself!" C 1055 is then not merely a parallel passage for *under-wat* in 1091, but is inseparably connected with it in the give and take of the two contestants. Either a different verb or a present tense in 1091 would quite obliterate the dramatic connection.

JOHN S. KENYON

HIRAM COLLEGE

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Lewis Theobald. His Contribution to English Scholarship. With Some Unpublished Letters. By Richard Foster Jones. New York: Columbia University Press, 1919. Pp. xi+363.

This interesting study, which has the twofold purpose of giving a biography and of demonstrating the derivation of Theobald's editorial method from Richard Bentley, acknowledges frankly a heavy indebtedness to Lounsbury's *Text of Shakespeare*, but fortunately excels that work in several respects. There is less of the clenched fist and flashing eye; and a greater brevity—perhaps it is tact—has suppressed some of Lounsbury's slashing conclusions. While Dr. Jones does not disagree with Lounsbury as often as he should, his volume is in general a safer book to consult than Lounsbury's, though the latter has a much greater wealth of documentation.

The relative slightness of the new material on Theobald's life and personality is disappointing. We should like more information as to the sources of his income, as to the basis of his friendly relations with Sir Robert Walpole; we should like to know why, in view of these relations, he appears from 1718 to 1728 more often in connection with the Tory Mist's journals than with any other newspapers; we are puzzled by the savageness of his attack on Pope, and cannot but wonder if he was urged to an aggressive tone by other influences than his undoubted love of truth. Did he consciously try to found his scholarly reputation on the ruins of Pope's?

Dr. Jones has limned us a personality for the editor; but this portrait seems not to be his happiest achievement. He speaks of Theobald as a modest, sensitive person, lacking in self-reliance and "rudely shaken by Pope" (see pp. 167, 204, 215, 250). Evidence for this view is found in Theobald's reliance on Warburton and in the remark of Dr. Grey that Theobald, "'a person seemingly in other respects very modest,' treated Pope too harshly notwithstanding *The Dunciad*." As evidence of something very different from modesty and diffidence—which seem almost Theobald's greatest lacks—one may cite the title-page and tone of *Shakespeare Restored*, Theobald's treatment of Meystayer in connection with the *Perfidious Brother*, his habit of exaggeration (p. 175), his dogmatic manner of speaking (p. 213), and even his attitude toward Warburton—the laying upon him of one request after another involving much labor, and when Warburton, restive for lack of an invitation to honor either the title-page or at least the Preface of Theobald's *Shakespeare* with his name, showed signs of setting up as an independent critic, the calm announcement on Theobald's part that his

acknowledgment in the Preface of Warburton's services "has entail'd this rich Consequence, *that it has given me a Right* (through your generous Grant) *to demand all your Capacities for my Service.*" (The italics are Theobald's.) These are not the words of a diffident man.

This matter of personality seems important, because the clash with Pope was largely a matter of personalities. In the war between the scholar and the *bel-esprit*, Pope, to be sure, early allied himself with the wits; but while his attack on "verbal criticism" is as explicit in his *Essay on Criticism* as in the *Dunciad*, the latter has an acridity born of personal dislikes. Not "blockheadry" but lack of wit and gentlemanly decorum was the hinge of Pope's satire on Theobald, as he plainly shows in the passage he adapts from La Bruyère concerning Theobald (see *Dunciad* of 1729, p. 184). If, on the other hand, Theobald had had a different personality, he would have listened to Pope's calls for help on Shakespeare, would have given some of his numberless emendations, would have received favors in return (for Pope could be generous in such cases), would have eventually become Pope's successor as editor of Shakespeare—and the world would have lost the *Dunciad*.

With regard to the vexed problems concerning this satire Dr. Jones is usually content with traditional views, especially those of Lounsbury. Most of these views have been based on the romantic assumption that Pope was as black as can be painted. Hence the malicious notion, generally accepted, that the "Bathos" was designed to serve as an *agent provocateur* to justify the *Dunciad*, a notion for which there is very little evidence. Presswork on the third, called the "last," volume of the *Miscellanies* had begun as early as June, 1727 (see the Elwin-Courthope *Pope*, IX, 524), and the expectation was to publish in the winter. The *Dunciad* was to conclude the volume. The "Bathos," which was "in great forwardness" in June, Pope intended for the fourth, called finally the "third," volume of the *Miscellanies*. Presently the poet determined to publish the *Dunciad* separately, and not having verses to fill the consequent gap in the "last" volume, he filled it with the "Bathos," the only one of the prose pieces fitted to appear in a volume devoted otherwise to verse. The *agent provocateur* theory demands the assumption that Pope feared the Dunces. Mystification with regard to the authorship of the *Dunciad* does not prove fear; for such mystification was natural to Pope; many of his major works appeared anonymously. He may have feared actions for libel, and he may have feared that his stooping to answer his lowly opponents—even though for twelve years their attacks had been frequent and (so far as we know) often unprovoked—would be a reproach to one of his standing; but his assurance of triumph over them is seen in his words to Swift (see the Elwin-Courthope *Pope*, VII, 124): "This poem will rid me of these insects." On the face of it, why should the "Bathos," which is predominantly an attack on the dulness of poets, be regarded as an attempt to provoke attacks to justify the *Dunciad*,

which primarily attacks scholarship? If Pope had been scheming to provoke outbursts from Theobald and his like, he would have changed the "Bathos" much more extensively, and Philips and Blackmore would there have yielded to Theobald in importance. Furthermore, the *Dunciad* came out only ten weeks after the "Bathos," and hence friend and foe alike would have seen that the poem was in press before many had time to make considered retorts to the prose attack. The "Bathos" is perhaps to be regarded as the first overt act in a Pope "offensive," but there is no *post hoc* relationship effectively established between it and the *Dunciad*. The current view of the matter, however, has even smaller grounds of credence if we accept it, as Lounsbury and Jones do, with the added notion that the "Bathos" failed to evoke any great quantity of attacks. Pope could easily have postponed the *Dunciad* until two or three volumes of attacks were added. The Lounsbury-Jones idea of the inefficacy of the "Bathos" finds its only basis in an unwarranted belief that all such attacks were included in a volume called *A Compleat Collection of all the verses, essays, Letters and Advertisements, which have been occasioned by the Publication of Three Volumes of Miscellanies, by Pope and Company* (1728). From the relatively slender resources at hand the reviewer has been able to find at least six additional attacks printed within the ten weeks between the "Bathos" and the *Dunciad*, and there is every reason to believe that the larger resources of English libraries would furnish several other items of the same sort. At times in his career Pope was the aggressor; he was not so in the case of Theobald. So far as the grounds of the quarrel go, on the other hand, Theobald certainly had the better of it, except for the fact that the needless aggressiveness of *Shakespeare Restored* struck the first blow.

So far as demeanor during the battle is concerned, we may readily agree with Dr. Jones that Theobald seems the more decorous. But we might have to revise this opinion if we knew as much about the small details of Theobald's career[1] as we do of Pope's. It is disingenuous of Theobald to insist that

[1] For example, if we knew the detailed activities of the so-called "Concanen Club." Dr. Jones, more judicious than Lounsbury, is frank to admit the existence of the Club. But both Lounsbury and he should have taken this Club and its connection with *Mist's Journal* more seriously. It is interesting to note that the leading article of (Mist's) *Weekly-Journal or Saturday's-Post* for March 20, 1725 (which is an attack on the *Shakespeare* of Pope and Tonson) says in closing: "And we take this Opportunity of inviting you [Mr. Mist], to be a Member of a Club or Society of Authors, which is to meet once a Week, or oftner, as Occasion shall require, to consider of Ways and Means for keeping up and maintaining the Privileges of Authors, and defending our Rights and Properties against the Incroachments of Booksellers and Players." Theobald was a member of this Club just being formed; his dedication of *Shakespeare Restored* is dated two days before this letter attacking Pope and announcing the Club appeared in the *Journal*. Clearly he was not commencing his attack without "moral support," and one may suspect that his unfortunate tone concerning Pope's work came in part from this Club. Another passage in the letter just quoted assures the seller of Pope's *Shakespeare* that a new, better edition "would reward him in the Sale." This seems certainly to hint that as early as 1725 Theobald dreamed of editing the dramatist.

"he had always treated Pope with deference and respect" (Jones, p. 112); but, so far as we know, he was guilty of nothing so bad as the "lies and half-lies" which Pope seems to have told. In at least one case, however, the poet was not so guilty as has generally been thought. He does not accuse Theobald (in the note to Book I, line 106, of the 1729 *Dunciad*) of ingratitude but of bad manners. Pope had publicly advertised for aid on his edition of Shakespeare; and Theobald, while not giving aid, had at the same time asked favors of Pope. His later defense against a supposed charge of ingratitude, while it has satisfied commentators from Nichols to Dr. Jones, seems not to answer the charge really made. Theobald is further disingenuous in his defense of concealing his design on Shakespeare when Pope asked for aid. In one letter (see Nichols' *Illustrations*, II, 221) he says: "To say I concealed my design is a slight mistake: for I had no such certain design, till I saw how incorrect an Edition Mr. Pope had given the publick." Unfortunately in another letter (see Lounsbury, pp. 331–32), Theobald had already used a totally different defense: "It is a very grievous complaint on his side, that I would not communicate all my observations upon Shakespeare, tho' he requested it by public advertisements. I must own, I considered the labor of twelve years' study upon this author of too much value rashly to give either the profit of it to a bookseller whom I had no obligations to; or to the credit of an editor so likely to be thankless." Theobald was certainly ready by 1725 to prosecute any design with regard to the text of Shakespeare that might yield most return in reputation. The prosecution was, on his side, entirely justifiable, but it was neither generous nor, in manner, quite gentlemanly. On the other hand we may grant that Pope distorted facts recklessly and often—as, for example, when he transferred the weekly crucifixion of Shakespeare from the *Censor* to *Mist's Journal;* but may one suggest that few commentators ever grant the possibility of an *unintentional* misstatement in Pope's work? The *Dunciad* seems fully as reckless as it does calculating in its malice.

Usually the effect of Pope's "libels" has been thought scathing; one hardly knows how to interpret Dr. Jones's view. On page 133 he says: "It is this variorum edition of *The Dunciad* that was largely responsible for the character of Theobald that has come down to recent times." On page 198, speaking of the period after Theobald's *Shakespeare* had appeared, Dr. Jones tells us that Theobald's "letters written at this time also show that his edition had entirely removed any stigma that might have been incurred from *The Dunciad*, and that he occupied a favorable position in the eyes of the public." Page 203 reiterates this view. If Theobald lived down the variorum *Dunciad*, it seems strange that after Pope deposed him in 1742, the odium should return. Has it ever been suggested that allied with Pope's satire was the fact that Theobald was neither a university man nor a clergyman? Very few men of his century outside that potent dual tradition attained to better reputation than did Theobald. In leaving this phase

of Dr. Jones's work one may remark that there is no occasion for amazement that Pope called the brilliant emendator dull; one need only remember that the *bel-esprit* from Solomon to Pope has tended to regard much study as a weariness and all editors as dull dogs. Theobald's letters here printed by Dr. Jones show more power of emendation than of personality.

The more valuable part of Dr. Jones's work is that which traces the methods of English scholarship in Theobald's day. The derivation of the method from Bentley is made so probable by Dr. Jones that few will dispute his conclusions. But having thus established the dependence of Theobald on the great classicist, Dr. Jones proceeds to forget Bentley at times and to heap all the credit upon his hero. We are told (p. 244) "that Jortin, Warton, Upton, and Church used a method which did not exist before Theobald." And on page 251 we read: "One reason why in the end Theobald's reputation was unable to overcome the misrepresentations of Pope lay in the fact that as his method became more general its source was obscured." But, it may be urged, Theobald did not originate; he only adapted; and Jortin, Warton, Upton, and Church were also capable of independent adaptation. It is not entirely clear in what respects Theobald modified Bentley's method. We are not told much except that while Bentley drew parallels for purposes of annotation or emendation from all possible sources, Theobald sensibly made a specialty of expounding Shakespeare by parallels from the dramatist himself and from books that he might have read. Patrick Hume, however, in his 321 folio pages of notes on Milton had cited many parallels from Milton's reading—for purposes other than emendation, to be sure—and he should receive credit for at least hinting this adaptation. Similarly, while approving in substance Theobald's claim that his work is "the first Assay of the kind on any modern Author whatsoever," one should consider at least Fenton's unsuccessful "assay" of Milton (1725) and possibly some editions of Continental authors. It is happiness in emendation that gives Theobald his soundest reputation today; he is less admirable for method. Dr. Jones tells us on page 192 that Theobald "blazed the trail succeeding editors have always followed"; and on page 219, that he "made popular a method which, with amplifications and modifications, has come down to the present day." If Dr. Jones had compared Theobald's methods with the brilliant textual methods that have recently been evolved for Shakespeare by Pollard, McKerrow, and other English scholars, he would have revised his account of the defects of Theobald's edition (pp. 189–91). Considered from a modern point of view Theobald's method was very bad for at least three reasons unstressed by Dr. Jones. Theobald chose the least authoritative text extant—Pope's—as the basis of his edition; he made no attempt, so far as Dr. Jones shows, to determine the interrelationships and relative authority of the different quartos and folios; and lastly he was far too eager to emend. It is very well to assert his insistence on proof for an emendation; he was not like Pope or Fenton in the matter. But one who boasts that he

can make five hundred more emendations on Shakespeare than a rival editor; who fairly early in his career announces two thousand emendations on Beaumont and Fletcher, and later can "amend and account for above 20 thousand Passages in Hesychius"—such a scholar seems not a model of method in the "critical doubt." For his own day, Theobald's method was good; but we may be thankful that it has not "come down to the present day" without being thoroughly revolutionized.

The ground covered by this study is most varied, extensive, and difficult. Dr. Jones has displayed great industry and good judgment; but it is not to be expected that a doctoral dissertation on so complex a field should be free from error. It is, therefore, with no desire to depreciate this judicious industry that the following errors are indicated. In view of the existing evidence[1] that "Book and the man" was a misprint in the first *Dunciad*, it is regrettable that Lounsbury's theory on the passage is accepted by Dr. Jones (p. 129). Again he follows Lounsbury and others in misdating the first appearance of Pope's "Fragment of a Satire," a misdating which would be harmless were it not for the unwarranted implications woven about the wrong date and Gildon's "venal quill" by Mr. Courthope. The proper date, with the first known version of the "Fragment," is found in the *St. James Journal* of December 15, 1722.[2] In speaking of Fielding's attitude toward Theobald, one should certainly mention chapter viii of a *Journey from This World to the Next.*

Errors, probably typographical, have been noted as follows: Zachary Pearce's name is misspelled, p. 40, note 26; on p. 357 the Index should refer to Hawley, not Harley, Bishop. A number of references are faulty: Note 47, on p. 19, does not support the text in all the assertions made. On p. 87, note 35, for 160 read 161. On p. 93, note 52 should refer to p. iv rather than to vi. Page 116, note 33, for 20 read 181; p. 156, note 2, for 422 read 322; p. 160, note 11, for 241–45 read 341–45; p. 166, note 27, for September 17 read September 19; p. 182, note 60, for xliv read xlvi; on p. 349, the reference concerning the *Metamorphoses* should be to Nichols' *Illustrations*, Vol. II, p. 711, not p. 708.

The bibliography of Theobald's works (Appendix D) is also susceptible of improvement. Complete bibliographical description of the works is never given, and title-pages are printed with unsystematic modifications. One would like statements as to how many times the various works were reprinted. Certainly the earliest editions should be listed, and this is not done in the case of the *History of the Loves of Antiochus and Stratonice*, here dated 1719, but apparently printed in 1717. *Ban and Syrinx, an Opera, in one Act* (so advertised in the *Weekly-Journal or Saturday's-Post* for

[1] See the Elwin-Courthope *Pope*, IV, 271, n, 2, and VII, 110.

[2] *Ibid.*, V, 445; see also for Mr. Aitken's discovery of this version the *Academy* for February 9, 1889.

March 22, 1718) is omitted from the bibliography altogether, though mentioned on page 26. The *Gentleman's Library*, which Dr. Jones has "found no trace or mention of . . . . except in Theophilus Cibber's *Lives of the Poets*, vol. 5, p. 287," and which he consequently dates 1722, is frequently advertised, as are several of Theobald's works, in the *Weekly-Journal* early in 1718. The advertisement should be interesting to any who believe Theobald above equivocation, because it attempts to give the anonymous work the protection of Sir Richard Steele's name. The advertisement notices the *Censor*, the *Gentleman's Library*, and the *Lady's Library*. Yoked by an "Also" with a long description of the *Censor* comes the following:

> The Gentleman's Library; containing Rules for Conduct in all Parts of Life, viz. Education, Learning, Dress, Conversation, and Choice of Friends, Love and Gallantry, Courage and Honour, Affectation, Idleness, Envy, Recreations and Studies, Lying, Wit and Humour, Drinking, Marriage and conjugal Vertues, Religion, Detractions, Talkativeness, Impertinent Curiosity, Pride, Contentment, Retirement, &, Also
>
> The Lady's Library, published by Sir Richard Steele.[1]

Dr. Jones's dissertation has been subjected to this detailed examination because, in spite of some few imperfections, it should displace much of the material in Lounsbury's brilliant but untrustworthy *Text of Shakespeare*. The imperfections seem due less to lack of ability on the part of Dr. Jones than to our American system which frequently imposes as the problem for a doctoral dissertation a task impossible of achievement in the time ordinarily allotted to such work.

GEORGE SHERBURN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Elements of Old English. By SAMUEL MOORE and THOMAS A. KNOTT. Ann Arbor, Michigan: George Wahr, 1919. Pp. vii+209.

Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Middle English Grammar. By SAMUEL MOORE. Ann Arbor, Michigan: George Wahr, 1919. Pp. vii+83.

For nearly thirty years no new textbook for the use of university classes in elementary Old English has appeared in America. During that period the best and most widely used book has been a reader with a grammatical introduction. Because of the brevity and schematic arrangement of the "Grammar" in that work, the book has not brought about a standardization of instruction in Old English; in some universities instructors interested in the scientific study of language have supplemented the "Grammar" by much

[1] *Weekly-Journal or Saturday's-Post*, 8 February, 1718; repeated at least eleven times thereafter.

detailed information and have given thorough drill in forms and phonology; but in too many, instructors have been satisfied with mere accuracy and quantity of translation. The new book of Professors Moore and Knott, if extensively used, will standardize the teaching of Old English. The first part ("Elementary Grammar") presents in a series of twenty-four lessons (each containing paradigms, grammatical explanations, and Old English text) a thorough survey of the sounds and forms of West Saxon. The information given is up to date (teachers of Old English will note with gratitude that at last we have a class book which explains that the so-called reduplicating verbs are based not on reduplication but on ablaut), and it is presented with the most painstaking definiteness. Everything that the student really needs to know is made clear. The last part of the book is a systematically arranged, succinct "Reference Grammar." The cost of printing unfortunately prevented the authors from providing a body of texts for reading; for most effective use, the book should be supplemented as soon as possible with enough texts to give material for the first course in Old English.

The second of the books named above, like the first, is meant for use as a companion to university and college courses. It is divided into seven parts: (1) "The Elements of Phonetics," (2) "Modern English Sounds," (3) "The Language of Chaucer," (4) "The History of English Sounds," (5) "Historical Development of Middle English Inflections," (6) "Middle English Dialects," (7) "Middle English Spelling." At first glance the series of headings may seem heterogeneous and lacking in unity or plan. Careful reading of the book, however, shows that its plan is logical and that the book can be profitably used in connection with almost any course (not too advanced) in the history of the English language. Its chief functions appear to be to give a concise, accurate body of fundamental information and to afford a means for correlating courses in Old, Middle, and Modern English, or widening the scope of any one course so as to make the student comprehend the whole history of our language. As in the case of *The Elements of Old English*, this book is up to date in its information and presents its material in the simplest and clearest terms. Professor Moore is to be congratulated on his phonetic alphabet, which looks to be comprehensible to an elementary student and successful as a means for the fairly exact recording of English and American sounds.

J. R. H.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *June 1920* NUMBER 2

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS IN HERDER'S THOUGHT. I

THE PRINCIPLE OF PERSONALITY

In the work of a writer who has produced a deep and far-reaching effect on the ideas and tendencies of his own and succeeding generations, and who is universally recognized as one of the few principal authors of an epoch in the history of civilization, there must have been acting, within the many contradictions imbedded in particular conclusions, within the endless modifications and concrete adaptations caused by the fortunes of a busy life and the pull and push of his environment by which is brought forward a constant stream of interests and inhibitions, and within the temporary and superficial bewilderments and perplexities as to methods of procedure, by which every pathfinder is beset—there must have been acting in all this diversity of mental effort a significant individual force, which, no matter how complex, can be expressed in a term of unity. As in the work of Herder's philosophical contemporary and early teacher, Kant, this term is found as the systematic criticism of the analytic reason, conceived as an absolute standard of knowledge; and in that of his poetical contemporary and early disciple, Goethe, in the spontaneous and harmonious response of all the faculties, emotional, imaginative, and intellectual, to the important concrete realities of life; so there must be attainable an integral conception of Herder, which may be regarded as the proper focus in which all the elements of his immensely rich product of ideas are joined.

LS

It is with the mental character of Herder that we are concerned. That there is need for further study of this subject, there is no doubt. The monumental work of Haym, which will continue for many years to be the classic biography of Herder, limits itself in its theoretical parts to relating Herder to the chief currents of systematic philosophy, particularly the rationalism of Leibnitz and Kant. This method of orientation fixes the focus of the account outside of Herder's thought, so that the latter's ideas appear as secondary forms of systems which have their unities in other minds, of which Herder inevitably appears as a more or less imperfect variant. No matter how sympathetic and large-minded such an account—and that of Haym is admirably so—it cannot present Herder's thought as an integral whole. It gives many of its principal aspects, but not as the expressions of the unified mental character, Herder, but rather as so many individual particulars plucked from, now this, now that, feature of the theoretical minds of various systematic philosophers.

It was perhaps in recognition of some of the shortcomings of this method, to which, however, he paid a disappointing allegiance in his introduction to Herder's *Ideen*[1] that Professor Kühnemann attempted to account for Herder's thought by his personality. He apparently did not realize that personality conceived as prior to mind—for it cannot be conceived as productive of mind unless it be prior to it—is devoid of meaning. Personality implies an indissoluble reciprocal union of the two common abstractions, the concrete person and his mind.

Moreover, such an account, if it could be successful, would not solve the problem at issue, which is the theoretical unity of Herder's thought. All the concrete facts of the growth of Herder's personality become relevant to this problem only through being brought into its focus. The failure of Professor Kühnemann's essay lies in his neither having brought out new essential facts nor having found the proper focus in which the old facts would acquire more significant meanings.

Other writers, who will be referred to in their proper places, limit themselves to relating particular theories of Herder to the

[1] In Kürschner's *National-Litteratur*, Vol. LXXVII, 1, 1; see also Eugen Kühnemann, *Herder's Persönlichkeit in seiner Weltanschauung*, Berlin, 1893.

history of kindred theories, without attempting to investigate the foundations of Herder's thought as a whole.

Herder's dominant intellectual interests and his most potent critical energies moved in the fields of literature, particularly poetry, and of art, and in these his principal ideas developed first and with greatest force and clarity. They entered later, and with less certainty and authority, though with great energy and comprehension, the fields of general history, which he regarded as the history of civilization or the human mind, education, systematic philosophy, ethics, even politics. He did not apply his original ideas even to religion, which was his profession, and which for a long time he even theoretically accepted naïvely in the form of Lutheran liberal orthodoxy, until he had done his most important work on literature, the arts, and history.

It is in these later fields that his thought occasionally suffers from a certain vagueness and from contradictions in theoretical construction. Most of his critics, especially those trained in systematic philosophy, being more interested in the apparent weightiness of his later subjects, are inclined to regard these lapses as fundamental flaws in his thought.

Herder has thus come to be judged an inspirer, a stimulator, a sort of John in the Wilderness, offering many and fertile suggestions, and giving, by the fineness of his temper and the richness of his knowledge and language, a strong and abundant impulse to other minds, endowed with the more essential gifts of trained critical or inspired artistical genius, but not as himself the possessor of truly fundamental powers or the bearer of a definitive message.

Herder's views were arranged, in accordance with his intuitive and concrete genius, not like those of his later great antagonist, Kant, in systematic order from clearly defined abstract premises to theoretic unity, but pragmatically, in concrete progression from one problem to another which involved embodiments of his principal ideas. The lack of systematic disposition pertaining to this method has been generally, though with only partial justice, mistaken for lack of any essential order, and has produced, even in serious students of Herder, an impression of fragmentariness and incoherence, which has obscured the high degree of completeness and consistency of his ideas.

Externally, his ideas are often clothed in the bristling array of direct and indirect conflict, sometimes with various intellectual faults of his age, but most often and prominently with the then ruling rationalistic tendencies in literary and aesthetic theory and in systematic philosophy, and carry some of the passing débris of conflict with them. It is necessary to cast aside this now useless and confusing encumbrance before the underived substance of his thought comes to the surface.

Since Lessing, at the time of his *Laokoon*, was the most eminent representative of aesthetic rationalism (from which he turned almost immediately afterward, in his *Dramaturgie*, and still more in the practice of *Emilia Galotti*, approaching the position of Herder), and since Kant remained the leader of philosophical rationalism, it was natural, even if not in keeping with his true importance, that Herder, whose ideas were antagonistic particularly to rationalism, should single them out for his criticisms, and be carried even to the length of partly presenting his own ideas not in their real positive bearings on his position, but in the negative and not essential relations of exceptions to his adversaries' conclusions and critical methods, with the result that he suffered the penalty, which the polemical author never wholly escapes, of having his positive products annexed as mere amendments to the body of the achievements of others. Even to the present day the general opinion regarding these critical essays has not been able to free itself from this illusion of the polemical aspect—an illusion which is one of the many shapes of that intellectual Proteus, overgeneralization.[1]

The first work in which, though limited to a particular aesthetical problem, there appeared in precise form the ideas whereon his theories were to rest in his *Erstes Kritisches Wäldchen*, published in the beginning of 1769, in which he proceeded from a radical criticism of the conclusions published three years before by Lessing in his *Laokoon* to a statement of his own position.

An investigation of Herder's theory should therefore start with this essay. Since, however, the subject of this study is not Herder's

[1] See for instance, in addition to those already mentioned, Professor W. G. Howard's scholarly introduction to his edition of *Laokoon, Lessing, Herder, Goethe*, (New York, Holt, 1910), pp. cl, clviii, in which the first *Wäldchen* is regarded chiefly as a criticism of Lessing's essay; Dr. Friedland, *Über das Verhältniss von Herder's "Erstem Kritischen Wäldchen" zu Lessing's "Laokoon"* (Progr. Bromberg, 1905).

aesthetical theory, but the fundamental complex of ideas underlying his aesthetical as well as all his other important theories, aesthetical detail will even in the chapter devoted to that *Wäldchen* be considered only as far as it lies in the focus of that complex.

SURVEY OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN AESTHETICAL THEORIES BEFORE LESSING

The chief importance of Lessing's *Laokoon* lies in its character as the most eminent attempt of the eighteenth century to combine the aesthetical element of the two principal philosophical currents of the era beginning with the Renaissance, the absolutistic-rationalistic, and the empirical-psychological, with its variant, the naturalistic-sensualistic. It foreshadows the attempt, represented by the Kantian philosophy, to extend this harmonization to the entire field of knowledge.

The rationalistic elements of Lessing's theory center in the traditional conception of "imitation" of truth and nature; the naturalistic-sensualistic, in a changed view of nature and new ideas regarding the dependence of all knowledge, and consequently, of the matters and techniques pertaining to poetry and the arts, upon the functions of the senses.

RATIONALISM IN AESTHETICAL THEORY

The doctrine of "imitation," "mimesis," was first formulated by Aristotle, who in his *Poetics* taught that art "imitated" not indeed the literal details of nature, but more or less generalized conceptions based on natural realities. This idea entered modern theory through Vida's and Scaliger's Latin works in which the rules given by Aristotle combined with those formulated by Horace were established as the absolute and ultimate canons of art and poetry.

This doctrine received its classical French form by Boileau, and thence was taken over into German literature, where it held sway almost until Lessing. The revolt of the Swiss, Bodmer and Breitinger, against the French influence as represented by Gottshed, was not directed against the principle of imitation as such, which was assumed to rest secure upon the authority of Aristotle, but against

the French rationalistic interpretation of the nature which was to be imitated.

Boileau identified nature with truth of ideas, reason. According to him, truth is both nature and the beautiful. "Nothing is beautiful except the true." "Nature is true," *et d'abord on la sent*, i.e., "and nature brings with it its own evidence." The imitation of this trinity of truth-of-nature-which-is-beauty must, however, not be literal, yet it must be clothed in sufficient verisimilitude to produce the "illusion" of reality. But it must not give pain. The imitation even of things in themselves offensive should give pleasure. The rules for accomplishing this result are embodied in, and to be derived from, classical art.

If we ask for a discussion of the meaning of the term beauty, Boileau answers, that beauty and taste have rules "absolute, universal, and necessary." This can only mean that they are superior to any conditions of environment or individuality and cannot be accounted for on any grounds of concrete empirical experience. The rationalistic conception excludes from its conception of beauty-nature-truth the character of individuality.

If we probe this conception farther, we find that it represents no ascertainable specific substance, but is a formal abstraction drawn from those works of classical art which have come down to us, and supported by classical and post-classical aesthetic theory. It is a conception without any authentic or original foundation. It rests not on the mental processes of creative art but of formal analysis at second hand.

Batteux' later doctrine that art should imitate only beautiful nature is largely a qualification of Boileau's formula.

Boileau's theory embraced the Horatian doctrine, "ut pictura poesis." For if general ideas are the proper subjects common to all the arts, there is no reason why the same laws of technique should not prevail in all.

NATURALISM IN AESTHETICAL THEORY

The naturalistic conception of reality produced two principal branches. The one, which concerned itself with the objective substance of nature, had its beginning with Bacon; the other, which

specialized in the particular sense-processes by which the objective reality "out there," in accordance with the dualism of that age, a remnant of the medieval view of life, was supposed to be conveyed to the mind "in here," started with Locke. This branch is called in some of its representatives associationistic, in others sensualistic, philosophy.

Bacon's own purpose was a general natural science which rejected all a priori methods of generalization and proceeded exclusively by inductive analysis of nature. But he, too, could not free himself from the dualistic tradition of medieval theology. He believed, and Hobbes agreed with him, that only scientific truth was amenable to reason, but that poetry was ruled by the imagination. While thus ignoring the Cartesian dualism of conscious mind and dead matter, which was characteristic of French rationalism and which underlay the aesthetic theories of Boileau and French classicism, he in turn established a different dualism in the opposition of a superior scientific reality, drawn from nature by inductive reasoning, to an inferior poetical reality pertaining to obscure processes of the imagination, which were regarded as spontaneous, intuitive, unanalyzable, irresponsible, and irrelevant to the serious business of life, and in their entirety, as essentially disparate from those of "reason."

Bacon and Hobbes, however, laid, without suspecting it, in this dualism the foundation of a movement which was for a time to assume far greater dimensions than the scientific movement they desired to bring about, and which in philosophy throughout the eighteenth century and beyond, all but overwhelmed it. This was subjective naturalism. The imagination, once having been acknowledged as the subjective organ for the apprehension and expression of nature, as the bridge between the inner emotions and the outer being, came necessarily to be regarded as the exclusive aesthetic faculty. As the formalism of rationalism, its absoluteness and emotional poverty, its lack of empirical flexibility, individuality, and spontaneity, grew less satisfactory through repetition, the absorption in a subjective, spontaneous, emotional interpretation of nature became more and more ardent. This reaction is known in the history of literature, especially in England, Switzerland, France, and

Germany, as the awakening of the nature-sense, the emotional revolt against rationalism, or the Romantic movement in its more general sense. It appeared, in one of its least extreme forms, in Shaftesbury's teaching that the highest test of worth is enthusiasm embodied in the aristocrat and man of the world, whose emotions have been trained to the highest degree of refinement. The revolt gave rise to the doctrine of the original genius as the sole standard of art and poetry, in Edward Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition* and in Diderot's essays; to the theories on imagination and native individuality based on English theory and further developed by Bodmer and Breitinger; to the emphasis put on the passions in contrast to ideas by Dubos and Diderot; to the ever-growing insistence on individuality and spontaneous impulse as the fundamental forces of life, which reached its climax in Rousseau. Further, it became generalized in the transcendentalism of Hamann, Wordsworth, and the Romantic poets and philosophers of Germany, the Schlegels, Wackenroder, Fichte, Schelling, Novalis, Grillparzer, and many others, the central idea of which is the absolute unity of nature and the soul of man in God, and in the conception of all truth as a unified ecstatic vision of spontaneous beatitudes unspoiled by worldly contacts. The identity of soul and nature, nature animism, *Naturbeseelung*, is the test of subjective naturalism in all its later forms.[1]

Compared with the abstract rationalism of the classical school, this subjective naturalism, with all its chaotic variations, uncertainties, and arbitrariness represented individuality and spontaneity as opposed to fixed and monotonous conventionality. Boileau's conception of beauty excludes creative originality both as to content and form. The poet's and artist's genius is limited to the adaptation of absolute traditional rules and forms of expression to ideas which have no final roots in his individual experience but in an impersonal, universal, i.e., extra-individual, absolute realm of truth. This lack of authenticity, this cold and unimaginative formalism is the fatal defect of all systems of aesthetic classicism since Aristotle.

[1] For the details of this development see von Hein, *Die Entstehung der neueren Aesthetik* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1886), Zweiter Abschnitt, pp. 81–271; Malcolm H. Dewey, *Herder's Relation to the Aesthetic Theory of the 18th Century* (University of Chicago Dissertation, George Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wis., 1920); W. G. Howard, Introduction to *Witkowski, Georg. Lessing's Werke.* Leipzig Bibliographisches Institut, Vol 4, Einleitung.

The aesthetic angers inherent in subjective naturalism, on the other hand, are those of the temptations of all subjectivity, which in its extreme forms leads to a self-centered disregard of objective reality, to impulsiveness and temperamental wilfulness and ethical irresponsibility—in short, to all the faults of Romanticism.

From the subjective naturalism of the eighteenth century we must distinguish the opposite tendency of purely objective naturalism, called materialism, which developed simultaneously with the former, and whose most extreme representatives were de Lamettrie, Dietrich von Holboch (*Système de la nature*),[1] and Helvetius. The materialists interpret nature as a purely physical mechanism, denying the reality of the soul, except as a symbol of physical forces. They are the direct opposite of the Romanticists. The form of nature, which materialistic art and poetry are supposed to imitate, is a literal aggregate of physical objects and their properties. The artistic naturalism which grew out of this movement rapidly succumbed to the triumph of the subjective-idealistic movement, which was to dominate European civilization for more than three generations. But it reappeared by the new scientific vehicle of evolutionary biology, in the last generation of the nineteenth century, as a great force in art and literature.

THE SENSUALISTIC BRANCH OF NATURALISM

The sensualistic, or psychological, branch of naturalistic philosophy had as its chief representatives Condillac and Diderot. Lessing was most directly influenced by Diderot, whose "lettre sur les sourds et les muets" offered a method for the sensualistic attack on the classical doctrine, "ut pictura poesis."

The sensualistic theory in aesthetics simply meant that since according to Locke the ideas contained in the mind are not innate but as it were in accordance with the dualism of the inner and outer realities peculiar to his age, carried there from the outer world by the senses, art and poetry must be differentiated in accordance with the particular sense which governs the means of expression pertaining to each. Consequently, poetry, which is communicated through

[1] Cf. Lange, "Geschichte des Materialismus," *Windelband, Gesch. d. Phil.* (1892), 5. Teil, p. 349.

the ear, must follow some particular order of association determined by the sense of hearing, and pictorial art, analogously, some particular order of association related to seeing.[1]

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HERDER'S CENTRAL IDEA

Lessing begins his argument in *Laokoon* with the assumption that the classical Greeks, while they permitted crying as an expression of pain in poetry, rejected it in sculpture, and that their motives for acting thus in apparent contradiction were considerations of beauty. Philoktetes, in Sophocles' drama, *Mars*, in the *Iliad*, when he is wounded by Diomed; Venus, in the *Iliad*, though but slightly scratched; Laokoon, in the *Aeneid*, when attacked by serpents, all cry out. The Trojans, on the other hand, are forbidden by their King Priam to cry. Lessing explains this difference by saying that Homer intended to make us realize the difference in civilization between Greeks and Trojans. The former could cry and yet retain their self-control, while the less-civilized Trojans, by giving way to their feelings, might be demoralized. Lessing adds that the modern man also refrains from giving free tongue to his feelings; but not, like the Trojans, from fear of losing his self-possession but from a deeply fixed habit of self-repression.

In Lessing's view, the fundamental difference between art and poetry is revealed by a comparison of the late-Greek sculptural group of the death of Laokoon, the Trojan high priest, who had warned his people against the wooden horse left by the Greeks, and of his two sons, in the coils of two serpents sent by Poseidon, with the passage in the *Aeneid* by which it had been inspired. In Virgil's account, Laokoon "lifts a fearful roar to the heavens," whereas in the group he is represented as a man who in an agonized struggle suppresses any outcry or at most emits a groan.

[1] Since the subject of this essay is not Herder's aesthetic theories but the fundamental ideas underlying his view of reality, to which his criticism of Lessing's *Laokoon* simply opens the most direct road of approach, a discussion of the numerous theoretic details pertaining to the doctrine of aesthetic naturalism and sensualism up to Lessing and Herder, would only tend to disturb the focus of this inquiry.

The principal writers on aesthetic theory are the following: in England, Shaftesbury, Jonathan Richardson, Joseph Spence, Daniel Webb, James Harris, Hutcheson, Hume, Edward Young; in France, Dubos, Batteaux, Caylus, Condillac, Diderot, Rousseau; in Germany and German Switzerland, Bodmer and Breitinger, Baumgarten, Winkelmann, Sulzer, and many others. See bibliographical references above, p. 72, footnote; and Windelband, *Gesch. d. Phil.* (Freiburg, 1892), 5. Teil, pp. 345 ff.

If, asks Lessing, men, and even gods cry out in Greek poetry without loss of dignity, why does the sculptor, who in making the statue of Laokoon followed the account of Virgil very closely, depart from the latter in the one particular of the crying? The reason cannot be in the unbecoming nature of crying as such, but must be in the difference of the means of expression pertaining to the two arts of poetry and picture-making. His final answer is that the Greeks depicted, or, to use his own term derived from Aristotle and French classical theory, "imitated" only *schöne Körper*. The Greek artist portrayed nothing except the "beautiful." Crying should not be depicted in sculpture because it gives the mouth the appearance of a cavity and distorts the face.

By this principle of formal beauty the Greek sculptor was obliged to refrain from the representation of certain passions which produce distortions of face and body, like rage and despair. Wrath has to be toned down to seriousness, misery to sorrow. When grief is too strong to be thus reduced to lineaments of beauty, as in the scene of Agamemnon at the sacrifice of his daughter, Iphigenia, the Greek artist veils the father's face.

Herder takes exception to every one of Lessing's generalizations. Lessing is mistaken in assuming that Homer's heroes generally cry. Agamemnon, when wounded, convulsively controls himself without crying, Hector, the Trojan, when struck by a heavy rock, falls in silence; Menelaus, wounded by an arrow, draws out the weapon without a sound; Diomed, badly wounded, asks Sthenelus to draw the arrow from the wound, uttering imprecations against his enemies. Philoktetes, in Sophocles' play, does not cry lustily, but represses his pain, giving vent to it only occasionally. Moreover, his pain is not mainly physical but mental; it is the hopeless desolation of a life of complete solitude, helpless squalor, want of care, affection, and fellowship, of all that makes life human. The fifth chapter, which consists of the analysis of Sophocles' *Philoktetes* is one of the fine pieces of literary analysis which abound in Herder's writings.

Pherekles, in the *Iliad*, when he is caught in flight, clamors loudly, not because Greek heroes cried customarily, but because Homer intended to depict him as a coward. Mars, when wounded by the javelin of Diomed, roars like ten thousand warriors so that

both armies are horrified, not because crying is a general law of Greek nature, but by virtue of his particular character as the gross, ferocious god of war raging in battle; and, analogously, Venus, though barely scratched, sets up a loud and piteous lament, not because all Greeks did likewise but because she is the tender, self-indulgent, petted goddess of love.

In thus showing that in Homer and other classical Greek poets the expression of pain is used as a means of characterization and not as a general formal convention, and that each different expression must be considered in its specific elements and relations to the character uttering it and to the circumstances in which that character moves, Herder replaces Lessing's rationalistic generalization by the true principle of individualization, which should dominate both poetic and artistic analysis.

He applies this principle also to Priam and the Trojans. Priam forbids his people to weep, not because they are barbarians and must be kept in an insensate condition, but because he is heroic and tries to make them realize that they must indulge in no grief while their native land is invaded.

From this analysis there follows an important conclusion which Herder draws in a discussion of elegiac poetry (chaps. iii and iv). In reviewing the poetry of suffering produced by different peoples, Herder finds that it reveals characteristic differences. For instance, Ragnor Lodbrog's song of former victories uttered in unbearable physical torture is characteristic of the ruggedness of the Norse character. Priam's lament over Hector's body, on the other hand, is expressive of the more gentle and civilized nature of the Trojan people. National elegies embody the national spirit of a people. Herder thus expands his principle of individual personality to that of a collective, racial, and national personality.

However, Herder continues, while each people has its own individuality, each is essential to the whole of humanity. It is wrong to suppose, as Lessing does, that the Greeks alone were truly human. From this it follows that the Greeks cannot be the sole possessors of the truth of the beautiful.

Moreover, it is wrong, as Lessing asserts, that the Greeks never represented anything but beauty. Lessing had said that the Greeks

had never pictured a fury. But, retorts Herder, the Greeks did depict ugliness. Medusa, with snakes instead of hair, Venus in Moschus' poem, grieving over the death of Adonis, are abhorrent. He draws several conclusions, which, while they appear as mere modifications of Lessing's theory, are in fact new principles. The permanent characters of the personages of high Greek art, Herder concedes, were never ugly or terrible, but their passing states of mind may be both. Secondary characters, however, may be ugly by way of contrast with the principal ones, as the giants under the chariot of angry Jove, or Satyrs, Silenus, and Bacchantes surrounding Bacchus, or the head of Medusa in the shield of Pallas Athene. So much for the gods. The same is true of the heroes. Thersites in the *Iliad* is not merely ridiculous, as Lessing thought, but an ugly, odious blackguard. Now Herder takes up the picture of Agamemnon veiling his face at the sacrifice of Iphigenia. Again Herder individualizes by showing that Agamemnon does not represent a universal principle of art, as Lessing thought, but that he acts as the great king he was. Ajax, or Medea, would have acted differently each in accordance with his or her individuality.

The additional principle, however, which determines Herder's discussion of the ugly and underlies that of Agamemnon's veiling his face, though it is not yet clearly realized by him, is that of the focus of composition, another form of individualization. This principle demands the subordination of all secondary factors in a composition in such a manner that the central idea, character, or action receives from those factors additional emphasis and significance. Thus the Satyrs, Silenus, and Bacchantes are not depicted for their own sakes, either as ideas or as forms of composition, but for the purpose of adding meanings and pictorial enrichments which a single figure of Bacchus could not possibly express. In the Iphigenia group, she, not Agamemnon, is the focal character, and the figure of Agamemnon had to be subordinated in the interest of the unity of the composition.

His principle of individualization gives Herder his standard for judging the remaining generalizations of Lessing. The roaring of Laokoon in Virgil's account according to this principle is not as Lessing assumes good poetry but as faulty there as it would be in

pictorial art. For it is not compatible with the dignity of his character. It is false individualization. The sculptor of the group, in giving Laokoon the expression and posture of silent agony, deviated from Virgil not because the technique of his particular art constrained him but because in this particular he was the better artist, gifted with a finer feeling for individuality. The best Greek artists, as is shown in the example of Philoktetes and many Homeric characters, do not make their lofty characters roar. Virgil, in the Laokoon scene, loses himself in externalities of description.

From the principle of individualization as opposed to Lessing's principle of general imitation of external objects, Herder proceeds to the formulation of the purpose of art which is higher than that of formal and abstract beauty. The new purpose which owes its emergence to the modern interest in nature, is *Wahrheit und Ausdruck*, expressive truth or characteristic or individual truth. He did not, however, now any more than later, go the length of the naturalistic demands of the Storm and Stress movement for an exclusively characteristic art. Artists, he says, are at all times limited in the full freedom of expressing the truth as they see it by tradition and convention. Among the ancients, for instance, the official religion was one of these limiting forces. It demanded that Bacchus have horns and so the sculptors of figures of Bacchus gave to the brows of their beautiful Bacchic youths indications of horns just sufficiently definite to satisfy traditional religion.

MARTIN SCHÜTZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[*To be continued*]

GERMANIC *w*-GEMINATION. I

That *w* caused far more geminations than is usually admitted is, I believe, a matter of incontrovertible proof. It is also evident that the geminations so caused date from various periods. Some are Primitive Germanic inherited from pre-Germanic; others North or WGermanic; and others restricted to a single dialect. The reason of this is because the *w* did not always come in contact with the preceding consonant. Given the right conditions an IE. *pu̯* in a *u*-stem might produce Germ. *pp*, *ff*, *bb*, *f*, *b*, or by analogy even *p*. Such parallel forms are very common, especially those with *pp*, *bb*; *tt*, *dd*; *kk*, *gg*, beside those with single consonants. Naturally when such parallel forms were once established, they were greatly multiplied by analogy. This was especially true of the verbs in *pp*, *tt*, *kk*, which came to have an iterative or intensive force.

Many examples of consonant lengthening have been wrongly attributed to *n*. We may properly exclude from Germ. *n*-geminations all words in which the loss of *n* cannot be explained. Even if OHG. *chnappo*, *chnabo* represent double paradigms from an original nom. **knabo*, gen. pl. **knabb̄nō* (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.*, I², 715); ON. *skabb*, OE. *sceabb* 'scab' cannot be referred to a Germ. **skaðb̄na-*, for in that case the *n* would have remained, just as *l* and *r* remain where they cause gemination. Much less can such forms as OHG *fethdhah* be explained as *n*-geminations. It is not here denied that *n* is responsible for many geminations: *pp*, *tt*, *kk*, this being a Prim. Germ. or pre-Germ. process in which the *n* was assimilated or absorbed. But in the later Germ. such a process cannot be claimed (with the exception noted above) in face of Goth. *rign*, *taikns*, *wēpn*, and many similar forms in N. and W. Germ.

A *w*-gemination may be suspected wherever related *-u̯o-*, *eu̯o-*, or *u*-stems are found. In some instances the *u*-stem remains in Germ., as in ON. *hǫttr* from **qatu̯-*, **qatu-*, with the *tt* generalized just as we have *nn* in Goth. *kinnus*:Gr. *γένυς*.

The *w*- geminations are here divided into two groups: Prim. Germ. words with *pp, mm, tt, kk;* and other, in most cases later, geminations of the labials, dentals, and gutturals. In the first group *pp* comes from IE. *-pu̯-, -bhu̯-; tt* from *-tu̯-, -dhu̯-; kk* from velar or palatal *-ku̯-, -ghu̯-*. These geminations must have taken place in pre-Germ. The process was about as follows: IE. *-pu̯-*, pre-Germ. *pp-*, Germ. *bb* (stop not spirant), later *pp;* IE. *-bhu̯-*, pre-Germ. *bbh*, Germ. *bb, pp*. Similarly with the dentals and gutturals. The gemination *nn* from *nu̯* is here omitted as it is generally admitted.

In the second group are included the geminations *ff, þþ, hh* (which may have been inherited from pre-Germ. *-pp-, -tt-, -kk-*, but more probably arose in Germ. from *-fw-* etc.); *pp, tt, kk* (which are likewise ambiguous, since they might proceed from pre-Germ. *bb, dd, gg* from *bu̯*, etc., or might have originated in Germ. or later from Germ. *pu̯* etc., to which the evidence in many cases points); and *bb, dd, gg*, which must have come from Germ. or later *ƀw, đw, gw*.

IE. *-pu̯-, -bhu̯-*: GERM. *-pp-*

1. OE. *upp(e)* 'up,' ON. *upp, uppi*, OS. *upp, ūp*, OE. *ūp*, OHG. *ūf*, Goth. *iup*, pre-Germ. **ŭpu̯a-, *eupu̯a-*: Lesb. *ὗπυ*, Lat. *s-uppus* (**supvos*); Gr. *ὑπό*, Skt. *úpa*, Goth. *uf*, OHG. *oba*. For the appended *u* compare Lesb. *ἀπύ*, ON. *ofugr* 'verkehrt,' OS. *aƀuh*, OHG. *abuh, abur, abo*:*aba* 'ab'; Goth. *ibuks*:*ib-;* Av. *anu*:*ana;* Goth. *inn*, probably from **enu̯a*:*in*, Gr. *ἐν*.

2. OE. *læppa* 'tag, end, skirt; lobe (of ear, liver); district,' OLG. *lappe* 'Zipfel eines Kleides,' MLG. *lappe* 'Stück, Fetzen Tuches oder Leders; das weiche Bauchfleisch der Tiere,' etc., **ləpu̯on-* 'flat piece, flap':Lat. *lappa* (**lapvā*), Czech *lopun, lopoun* 'Klette,' *lopáč* 'flache Schaufel,' Slov. *lopár*, Serb.-Cr. *lòpār* 'Backschaufel, Schieber,' LRuss. *łopár* 'Spatel zum Lehmkneten,' OE. *læfer* 'thin plate of metal; bulrush,' N.E. dial. *liverack* 'the English iris; the bulrush.' Cf. Nos. 46, 51.

3. MDu. *ruppe, rūpe* 'Raupe,' MLG. *rūpe idem, roppen* 'rupfen, zupfen,' MDu. *roppen, ruppen* 'pluck at, tear off; eat greedily,' MHG. *rupfen, ropfen*, Germ. **rupp-*, pre-Germ. **rupu̯-*:Lith.

rupùs 'grob, uneben, rauh,' *rupūzẽ* 'Kröte,' Lett. *rupuzis idem*, *rupuls* 'ein grobes Stück Holz; ein Grobian,' Pol. *rupić* 'bite,' *rypać* 'scindere, friare,' OE. *rēofan* 'break, tear,' etc. Cf. No. 53.

4. MDu. *rappe*, MHG. *rapfe* 'Krätze, Räude,' OHG. *raphen*, NHG. dial. *rapfen* 'verharschen,' OHG. *rāffi* 'rauh,' Germ. **rapp-*, *rēp-*, pre-Germ. **ropu̯-*, *rēpu̯*: No. 54.

5. MDu. MLG. *stoppe*, *stoppel* 'Stoppel,' MHG *stupfe*, *stupfel*, OHG. *stupfila idem.*, *stupf*, *stopfo*, *stopfa* 'Punkt, Tupf, stimulus,' *stupfen* 'leicht berührend stossen, stacheln, antreiben,' MLG. *stoppel* 'Stachel,' Germ. **stupp-*, pre-Germ. **stupu̯-*, whence also with later assimilation Germ. **stubb-* from **stub̆w-*: ON. *stubbr*, *stubbe*, 'stub,' ME., MLG. *stubbe idem*, NE. *stubble*: Gr. *στύππη* 'tow,' Lett. *stupure*, *stups* 'das nachgebliebene Ende von etwas Gebrochenem,' ON. *stúfr* 'Stumpf,' etc.

Here also I would add, as genuine Germ. words, OE. *for-stoppian* 'stop up, close,' OLG. *stuppon*, MDu., MLG. *stoppen* 'stop up, stop,' OHG. *stopfōn* 'pungere,' MHG. NHG. *stopfen*, Germ. **stuppōn*, *-ōjan* 'stuff, stop up; stop,' pre-Germ. **stupu̯ā-* and **stúpu̯o-* in Germ. **stuffa-*, **stufwa-* 'Stoff,' whence Ital. *stoffa*, *stoffo*, OFr. *estoffe*, Fr. *étoffe*, with reborrowing in Germ.

6. Norw. *duppe* 'tauchen,' OE. *dyppan* 'dip; baptize,' *doppettan* 'dive, plunge (of water-birds),' MDu. *doppen* 'dip, sop, eintunken,' Germ. **dupp-*; **dubw-*: MLG. *dobbe* 'Niederung, Vertiefung; Sumpf,' MDu. *dobbe* 'pit, ditch,' *dobben*, *dubben* 'immerse, duck; deepen, dig,' NE. dial. *dub* 'puddle, small pool of foul, stagnant water'; MHG. *tobel* 'Vertiefung, Waldtal,' OE. *dūfan* 'dive,' etc. Or the forms with *pp* may come from Germ. *-pw-*: Lith. *dubùs* 'tief und hohl,' Goth. *diups* 'deep.'

7. MDu. *dop(pe)* 'dish, pot; pod, shell, but always of something more or less round; top; stud, brooch,' MLG. *dop(pe)* 'Schale, bes. von Eiern, Kapsel, Kelch, Topf; Kreisel; Knopf,' ON. *doppa* 'Knopf,' Norw. dial. *dupp* 'Büschel, Wipfel,' MHG. *topfe*, *topf* 'Kreisel, turbo,' *topf* 'Topf, Hirnschale,' Germ. **dupp-* 'whirl, roll, any round object,' probably from pre-Germ. **dhubhu̯-*: Gr. *τῡφώς* 'turbo, whirlwind,' *τύφοι· σφῆνες* Hes. (cf. *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 332): Norw. dial. *dubb* 'Bolzen,' Swed. *dubb* 'Zapfen,' MDu. *dobbe* 'plug, stopper,' NHG. Tyrol. *tuppə* 'large chunk of wood,' Germ. **dub̆w-*: MHG. *tübel*

'Klotz, Pflock, Zapfen, Nagel,' MLG. *dovel* 'Zapfen,' etc. (cf. Fick, I⁴, 466).

8. ON. *knappr* 'Schale, Trog,' OE. *hnæpp* 'cup, bowl,' OHG. *hnapf* 'Napf,' Germ. **hnappa-* 'compact mass, chunk,' OSwed. *napper* 'knapp,' ON. *hneppr idem* (**hnappia-*), *hneppa* 'klemmen, drängen,' OE. *hnæppan* 'strike (against),' pre-Germ. **qnabhu̯-*: Lith. *knabùs* 'langfingerig, diebisch; geschickt,' Gr. κναφεύς 'carder, fuller,' κναφεύω 'card, full,' κνάπτω 'scratch, scrape; tease, card or comb wool; mangle, tear,' Lith. *knabėti* 'abschälen,' ON. *hnóf* 'schnitt ab.'

9. Norw. *knapp* 'enge, kurz, knapp,' LG. *knapp*, 'gering kurz, spärlich, rasch,' ON. *knappr* 'Knorren, Knopf,' OE. *cnæpp* 'top, mountain-top; brooch,' probably from pre-Germ. **gnabhu̯-*, **gnabhu-* (parallel with No. 8), whence Germ. **knappa-* in the above and **knaƀwa*(*n*)- in Norw. dial. *knabb*(*e*) 'Knollen, Bergknollen,' Swed. dial. *knabbe* 'Klotziges,' OHG. *knappo* 'Knabe,' *knabo idem.*, OE. *cnafa* 'boy; servant,' NE. *knave* 'a mean, low person,' NHG. dial. *knabe* 'Stift, Keil.'

10. LG. *kippen* 'wanken, schwanken, umwerfen,' NHG. dial. *kipfen* 'kippen,' *kipfe* 'Spitze,' Germ. **kipp-*, pre-Germ. **gibhu̯-*: Lat. *gibbus* 'nach aussen gewölbt,' *gibbus, gibba* 'Buckel, Höcker' (**gibvos*): Lith. *geibus* 'plump, ungeschickt,' Lett. *ģeibulis, ģībulis* 'Schwindel, Ohnmacht,' *ģeibt, ģībt* 'schwindelig, ohnmächtig werden,' Norw. dial. *keiv* 'schief, gedreht, verkehrt,' *keiva* 'linke Hand,' *keiv, keiva* 'linkische, unbeholfene Person,' *keiven* 'klotzig, unbeholfen, plump,' etc. (cf. Walde,² 340; Persson, *Beitr.*, 83f.).

Root **gei-* 'bend, turn' parallel with **geu-*: Norw. *kima* 'sich drehen, wiegen,' *keima* 'sich seitwärts biegen, den Kopf schief halten; schwingen, hin und her schweben'; ON. *keikia* 'den Oberkörper rückwärts biegen,' *keikr* 'mit zurückgebogenem Oberkörper,' *kikna* 'sich rückwärts biegen,' Norw. *kīka* 'look at anything, esp. to turn or stretch to look,' Swed. *kīka* 'schielen, gucken'; Icel. *keis* 'runder (ausgebogener) Magen,' Norw. dial. *keis* 'Biegung, Krümmung,' *keisa* 'bogen-förmige, krumme Bewegungen machen,' *kīs* 'Buckel (an Kleidern, Schuhen),' *kīsa* 'schielen, blinzeln' (cf. Persson, *Beitr.*, 87), NHG. Swiss *chīren* 'nach einer Seite neigen, z.B. von einem Wagen,' MHG. *kēren*, OHG. *kēran, chērren* (**kaizian* or **kairian*) 'kehren, (um)wenden, eine Richtung geben.'

11. OE. *cuppe* 'cup,' *copp* 'summit,' *coppede* 'having the top cut off, polled,' *ātor-coppe* 'spider,' ON. *koppr* 'Tasse, Napf, halbkugelförmige Erhöhung,' MLG. *kop, koppe* 'Becher,' *kop* 'Kopf; Schröpfkopf,' *koppen* 'köpfen, den Kopf, die Spitze abschlagen,' MDu. *coppen idem, coppe* 'round top, crown of the head; spider,' OHG. *kopf* 'Becher, Hirnschale, Kopf,' ON. *kúpóttr* 'rund, kegelförmig,' Norw. dial. *kūp* 'Ausbauchung, Höcker,' Germ. **kuppa-, *kūpa-*, pre-Germ. **gŭbhu̯o-*: Lat. **gubbus* 'humpback' (cf. Walde[2], 340), Icel. *kúfr* 'rundlicher Gipfel,' ON. *kúfungr* 'Schneckenhaus,' Du. *kuif* 'Haube, Federbusch, Wipfel.'

12. OE. *cipp* 'log, trunk; plowshare; weaver's beam,' NE. *chip* 'a small fragment of wood, stone, or other substance, separated by a cutting instrument,' verb 'cut into small pieces, hack away; break or fly off in small pieces,' MLG. *kippen* 'ausbrüten,' WFal. *ūtkippen* 'ausschlagen (von Bäumen),' Flem. *kippen* 'ausschlagen, geboren werden, kälbern,' ON. *kiappe* 'Ziegenbock,' OS. *kip* 'stock,' OHG. *kipfa* 'Runge,' ON. *keipr* 'Kerbe (für das Ruder),' MLG. *kēp* 'Kerbe,' Germ. **kipp-, *kaip-*, 'split, burst, sprout, hatch, etc., pre-Germ. *ĝibhu̯-, ĝoibhu̯*, probably identical with the following. Compare the root **ĝei-* in Goth. *keinan* 'keimen,' OE. *cīnan* 'gape, crack,' *cinu* 'chink'; OHG. *kīmo* 'Keim'; *kīdi* 'Schössling, Spross,' NHG. Swiss *chīden* 'keimen,' ON. *kiđ* 'kid,' OHG. *kizzi* 'Kitz'; OHG. *kīl* 'Keil'; EFris. *kīsen* 'sich spalten, klaffen, gähnen, gaffen.'

13. ON. *kippa*, 'heftig rücken, haschen, schnappen,' 'pull, jerk,' *kippask um eitt* 'um etwas streiten,' NIcel. *kippast viđ* 'make a sudden motion, startle,' *kippur* 'pull, jerk; shock,' OSwed. *kippa* 'raffen,' Swed. *kippa efter andan* 'nach Luft schnappen,' MDu. *kippen* 'catch, trap,' *kippe* 'trap, snare,' Norw. dial. *kīpa* 'huschen, hüpfen, rasche Bewegungen machen,' *kīpen* 'ausgelassen, wild,' Swed. dial. *kīpa* 'nach Luft schnappen,' MDu. *kīpen* 'sich anstrengen,' N.E. *chipper* 'active, lively, brisk; cheerful; pert,' dial. *kipper* 'light, nimble, frisky, in good spirits; eager,' etc., Germ. **kipp-, kīp-*, probably pre-Germ. **ĝībhu̯-*: ON. *kífa* 'zanken,' *kíf* 'Zank, Streit,' MLG. *kīven* 'zanken, streiten,' MHG. *kīben idem., kibelen* 'scheltend zanken,' *kippen* 'schlagen, stossen'; OE. *cāf* 'prompt, active, bold,' Lett. *fibēt* (zucken, vibrare) 'blitzen, glänzen,' Lith. *žibėti* 'glänzen, glänzend strahlen, schimmern,' *žiburỹs* 'Licht, Fackel,' *žibùtė* 'Flitter,' *žaĩbas* 'Blitz' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Got. Wb.*[2], 177).

Compare the root **ĝei-* in the following: Bal. *zinaγ* 'an sich reissen, hastig ergreifen, mit Gewalt wegnehmen,' Av. *zināṭ*, OPers. *a-dinā* 'nahm weg,' Skt. *jināti* 'raubt, beraubt, bedrückt,' *jyānam* 'Bedrückung,' Av. *zyānəm* 'Schaden,' Swed. dial. *kia* 'nach Luft schnappen,' Norw. dial. *kīkja, kikna* 'palpitare, keuchen,' MHG. *kīchen idem*, OE. *cīdan* 'quarrel, complain; blame, chide,' *gecīd* 'strife,' ON. *kítask* 'zanken, streiten,' *kíma* 'spotten,' *kiminn* 'spottend,' Swed. dial. *kisa* 'sich anstrengen,' *kēsa* 'biesen,' Norw. dial. *keisa* 'laufen, biesen,' etc.

IE. *-mu̯-*: GERM. *-mm-*

14. Goth. *faurdammjan* 'verdämmen, hindern,' ON. *dammr* 'dam,' etc., Germ. **damma-*, pre-Germ. **dhəmu̯o-*: Gr. **θαμύς*, pl. *θαμέες* 'crowded, close, thick,' *θαμέως*, *θαμά* 'together, in crowds; often.' The usual explanation that *dam* is from **dhəmno-* is inadmissible.

15. ME. NE. *clam* 'sticky, viscous, clammy,' verb 'smear, daub; stick, glue,' MDu. Du. *klam* 'moist, clammy,' etc., Germ. **klamma-*, pre-Germ. **gləmu̯-*: Gr. **γλαμυ-* in *γλαμυρός* 'blear-eyed,' *γλάμυξος idem* (for **γλαμυ-μυξος*); *γλάμη* 'humor in the eyes,' *γλάμων* 'blear-eyed,' etc.

16. ON. *suimma, suamm, summenn* 'swim' and *suima, suam, sumenn* come from original *suimma, suam*, etc., pre-Germ. **su̯emu̯ō*, **su̯ome*.

17. OE. *grimm* 'cruel, fierce,' *grimman* 'rage,' ON. *grimmr* 'grimmig,' OS. *grimman* 'toben,' etc., may have *mm* from *mu̯*, in the verb primarily only in the present: Gr. *χρέμυλος*, *χρομύλος*.

IE. *-tu̯-*, *-dhu̯-*: GERM. *-tt-*

18. ON. *knǫttr* 'Kugel, Ball,' Germ. stem **knattu-*, pre-Germ. **gnotu̯-*, Norw. *knott* 'kurzer und dicker Körper, Knorren': ON. *knoðа* 'drücken, kneten,' etc.

19. ON. *hǫttr*, OE. *hætt* 'hat,' from **hattu-*, pre-Germ. **qatu̯-*: Lat. *cappa* 'cap,' **qatu̯ā* (cf. *Class. Phil.*, XIV, 261).

20. OE. *clott* 'lump,' NE. *clot*, MDu. *clotte*, MHG. *kloz* 'klumpige Masse, Kugel,' NHG. *klotz;* MLG. *klūt(e)* 'Erdklumpen, clod,' ON.

klútr 'Lumpen, clout,' OE. *clūt* 'piece of cloth, clout, patch; metal plate;' MLG. *klōt*, MDu. *cloot* 'clump, lump, ball,' OHG. *klōz* 'rundlicher Klumpen,' NHG. *klosz*, NE. *cleat*, Germ. **klutta-*, *klūta-*, *klauta-* with *-tt-*, *-t-* from pre-Germ. *-dhu̯-* or *-tu̯-*: ME. *clodde* 'clod,' *cloud* 'a mass of rock; cloud,' OE. *clūd* 'rock,' Russ. *glúda* 'Klumpen, Kloss,' Slov. *glûta* 'Beule, beulenartige Geschwulst,' Gr. γλουτός 'rump, buttocks,' τὰ γλούτια 'buttocks; two lobes of the brain.'

21. MHG. *statzen* 'aufrecht sitzen, sich brüsten; stammeln, stottern,' Germ. **statt-*, pre-Germ. **stətu̯-*: ON. *stǫðua* 'stop, check,' Lith. *statùs* 'steil; unhöflich,' Lat. *statuo* 'set, establish; raise, erect.' Cf. No. 64.

22. OE. *lætt* 'lath,' OS. *latta*, MDu. *latte idem*, Germ. **lattō*, pre-Germ. **lətu̯ā*: MHG. *lade* 'Brett, Bohle, Laden,' etc. Cf. No. 65.

23. OE. *mattoc* 'mattock,' OHG. *steinmezzo* 'Steinmetz,' Germ. **matt-*, pre-Germ. **matu̯*: OBulg. *moty-ka* 'Hacke.'

24. ON., MLG. *motte* 'moth,' Germ. **muttan-*, pre-Germ. **mutu̯on-*: ON. *moð* 'Schabsel, Schrot,' Cf. No. 66.

25. OE. *cottuc* 'mallow,' formed from a Germ. **kutta-* bunch, 'tuft,' also in OS. *kot* (pl. *kottos*) 'grobes, zottiges Wollenzeng, Decke oder Mantel davon,' OHG. *choz*, *chozzo idem*, *umbi-chuzzi* 'Obergewand': OE. *codd* 'bag; husk,' etc. Cf. No. 70.

26. OE. *dott* 'speck, head (of boil),' NE. *dot*, EFris. *dott* 'Büschel, Haufen, Zotte,' Norw. *dott* 'Wisch, kleiner Haufen,' MDu. *dotten*, *dutten* 'verrückt sein,' MLG. *vordutten* 'verwirren,' MHG. *vertutzen* 'betäubt werden,' *getotzen* 'schlummern,' etc., Germ. **dutt-*, pre-Germ. **dhudhu̯-*: ME. *dudd(e)* 'a coarse cloak,' NE. *duds*, LG. *dudel* 'herabhängender Flitter an Kleidungsstücken,' Gr. θύσανος 'tassel, tag, tuft' (*MLN*, 22, 235). Cf. No. 68.

27. OE. *plætt* 'blow with flat hand, smack,' *plættan* 'smack, strike with open hand,' Swed. dial. *plätta* 'schlagen, klatschen' Germ. **platt-*, pre-Germ. **blatu̯-*: Lat. *blatuo*, *blatio*, *blatero* 'babble, prate,' MLG. *pla(d)dern* 'plappern,' EFris. *pladdern* 'ein platschendes oder klatschendes Geräusch machen.'

28. ON. *pottr*, OE. *pott* 'pot,' Norw. dial. *pott* 'small cushion'; EFris. *püt* 'Geschwulst, Beutel, Sack,' Du. *puit* 'frog,' *puit-aal*, OE. *ǣle-pūta* 'eel-pout,' Germ. *-tt-*, *-t-* from pre-Germ. *-dhu̯-* or *-du̯-*: MDu. *podde* 'toad' (No. 74), OE. *pudoc* 'wen, wart,' Germ. **puduka-*

'swelling,' Lat. dial. *būfo* 'toad,' **būdhō; buda* 'sedge,' Gr. *βυζόν· πυκνόν, συνετόν, γαῦρον δὲ καὶ μέγα* Hes.

29. MDu., MLG. *stutten* 'stützen, absteifen,' OHG. *stutzen*, MHG. *stützen*, **stuttian* with *-tt-* from pre-Germ. *-tu̯-*:OE. *studu, stuþu* 'stud, pillar, buttress,' MHG. *stud* 'Stütze, Pfosten,' OE. *stod* 'post,' ON. *styðia* 'stützen.'

30. Goth. *skatts* 'piece of money, money,' ON. *skattr* 'tribute, tax,' OE. *sceatt* 'coin, money; property; tribute, rent,' OFris. *sket* Geld, Vieh,' OS. *scat* 'Geldmünze, Geld, Besitz,' OHG. *scaz* 'Münze, Geld, Reichtum, Schatz,' Germ. **skatta-*, pre-Germ. **skhətu̯o-* 'piece:coin, money; property:cattle' (cf. Nos. 61, 76). The meaning 'cattle' might have developed directly from 'stript, fleeced,' with reference to the animals whose hides or fleece were stripped or pulled off. In this sense may be derived Germ. **skēpa-* 'sheep,' pre-Germ. **skhē-bo-* 'stript or fleeced animal.' For meaning compare ON. *fær* 'sheep':Gr. *πόκος* 'fleece,' *πέκω* 'strip, pull off, clip, shear,' and IE. **pe̯ku* 'pecu, pecunia.' Compare **skhē-go-* in Skt. *chāga ḥ* 'Bock,' *chāgā* 'Ziege':OFris. *skāk* 'Beute, Raub' (what is stripped off), MLG. *schāk idem*, OHG. *scāh* 'Räuberei, Raub,' *scāhhari* 'Räuber,' OFris. *skēka* 'rauben,' MLG. *schāken idem*, Germ. **skēk-* 'strip:rob,'and **skak-* 'strip, piece, point' in OHG. *scahho* 'promontorium,' *scahho meres* 'Landzunge,' ON. *skekill idem.*

The explanation of Goth. *skatts* as from **skhətu̯ó-* would seem to be inadmissible in view of Goth. *fidwōr* 'four':Skt. *catvāraḥ*. But *fidwōr* may be rather from **qᵘetuu̯óres* becoming later **petu̯óres* (with *p* from **penqᵘe* 'five'). Compare Lat. *quattuor, quattor*, for **quatuor, quattor.*

31. ME. *smīten* 'cast, smite; go,' MDu. *smīten* Du. *smijten* 'schmeissen, werfen,' MHG. *smīzen* 'schmeissen,' etc. may come from pre-Germ. **smeitu̯ō*, properly only in the present, becoming Germ. **smītō*, with *t* generalized:Lat. *mitto* (cf. Walde², 489) from **smeitu̯ō*. Compare with *tt* MHG. *smitzen* 'etwas Spitziges schnell bewegen; geisseln, hauen,' *intr.* 'eilig gehen, laufen,' *smitze* 'Hieb, Streich,' etc. and Goth. *gasmiþōn* 'schmieden.'

In this case the above cannot be directly compared with Goth. *bismeitan* 'bestreichen, beschmieren,' OE. *smītan* 'smear,' Norw. *smīta* 'bestreichen,' *smiten* 'einschmeichelnd,' etc.:Lett. *smaidît*

'schmeicheln,' *smaida* 'Lächeln,' Gr. μειδάω 'smile,' etc. (cf. *Mod. Phil.*, IV, 496 f.).

IE. *-qu̯-*, *-k̂u̯-*, *-ghu̯-*, *-ĝhu̯-*: GERM. *-kk-*

32. Norw. *lakka* (**lakkōn*) 'hüpfen, trippeln,' MLG. *lecken* (**lakkian*) 'mit den Füssen hintenausschlagen,' MHG *lecken* 'mit den Füssen ausschlagen, springen, hüpfen,' pre-Germ. **laqu̯-* 'bend': ON. *lœr*, Swed. *lår* 'Schenkel' (**lahwaz*), OE. *lēow* 'thigh, ham' (**legwaz*), Lat. *laqueus* 'noose, snare,' ChSl. *lakŭtĭ* 'Ellenbogen,' Gr. λακτίζω 'kick, stamp or trample on; struggle convulsively, quiver, throb,' etc. (cf. Fick, III[4], 357).

33. ON. *rokkr* 'Oberkleid, Rock,' OE. *rocc*, OFris. *rokk*, MDu. *rock*, MLG. *rock* (and *roch*), OHG. *roc* (*-ck-*, *-cch-*) *idem*, Germ. **rukka-*, pre-Germ. **ruqu̯o-* 'hide with the hair on': OE. *rȳhœ*, *rēowe* 'blanket, rug,' OLG. *rūgi*, *rūwi* 'rauhes Fell, grobe Decke.'

34. ME. *rokken* (and *roggen*) 'rock,' NE. *rock* 'move backward and forward, cause to sway, cause to totter,' OHG. *rucch* 'geschwinde Fortbewegung,' *rucchen* 'fort-, wegbewegen,' MHG. *rücken*, *rucken*, *rocken*, MLG. *rucken*, ON. *rykkia* 'pull, jerk, wrench,' *rykkr* 'pull, jerk,' etc., Germ. **rukk-*, pre-Germ. **ruk̂u̯-*: Lith. *ruszus* 'tätig, geschäftig, arbeitsam,' *ruszanti* 'tätig sein, sich beschäftigen,' *ruszyti* 'antasten,' *rùszinti* 'berühren,' root **reu-* 'ruere.' Cf. No. 104.

35. ON. *skykkr* 'undulatory motion,' OLG. *skokk* 'schaukelnde Bewegung,' MLG. *schucke* 'Schaukel,' *schocken* 'sich hin und her bewegen, zittern,' ME. *shokken*, NE. *shock* 'strike against suddenly and violently; strike as with indignation, horror, or disgust; cause to recoil, as from something astounding, appalling, hateful, or horrible,' Germ. **skukk-*, pre-Germ. **sququ̯-*: ME. *shoggen* 'shock,' etc. No. 102.

36. OE. *sciccels*, *sciccing*, *scincing* 'cloak,' ON. *skikkia* 'Überwurf, Mantel,' OHG. *scecho* (**sceccho*) 'stragulum,' MHG. *schecke* 'Leibrock, Panzer,' MLG. *schecke* 'Wams für Kriegsleute,' pre-Germ. **sqe(n)qu̯-*: Skt. *kañcukaḥ* 'Panzer, Wams, Mieder,' Gr. ποδοκάκκη 'stocks for the feet; Norw. dial. *skaak* (**skēk-*) 'Gabeldeichsel,' ON. *skǫkull idem* (perhaps with analogical *k* for *kk*), OE. *scacol* 'shackle,' etc. (cf. Fick, III[4], 447).

37. MHG. *benīchen* 'sich neigen, sinken,' *nicken* 'beugen; sich neigen, nicken,' MLG. *nicken* 'niederbewegen, bes. von den Augen, blinzeln, conivere,' Germ. **hnīk-*, *hnikk-*, pre-Germ. **qnĭĝhu̯-* (not **qnigᵘh-*): Goth. *hneiwan*, OE. *hnīgan* 'bend down, sink down,' Lat. *cōnīveo* 'close (the eyes), blink; be darkened,' Gr. *κνῑφός*, *σκνῑφός* 'dark, overcast, dim; dim-sighted, purblind,' *σκνῑφόω* 'darken, make dim' (with *φ* from *ĝhu̯-* or *bh*).

38. EFris. *prakken* 'pressen, drücken, quetschen, kneten,' Germ. **prakk-*, pre-Germ. **broĝhu̯-*: Gr. *βραχύς* 'small, short, trifling,' **brĝ̥hu-* 'compressed,' Goth. *ana-praggan* 'bedrängen,' MHG. *phrange* "Einengung, Einschliessung," *phrengen* 'pressen, drängen, bedrücken,' NHG. Bav. *pfreng* 'eng,' Cf. No. 105.

IE. *-bu̯-*: GERM. *-pp-*

39. OHG. *scaph*, *scapf* (and *scaf*) 'Gefäss für Flüssigkeiten,' MHG. *schapfe* (and *schaffe*) 'Schöpfgefäss,' ON. *skeppa* 'Scheffel' (**skappiōn-*), MLG. *schap* gen. *schappes* 'Schrank, um Geld, Speise, Kleider etc. aufzubewahren,' MDu. *schappigh*, *schappelick* 'bene formatus, formosus, compositus, decens, speciosus,' Germ. **skapp-*, pre-Germ. **sqabu̯-*: Lett. *skabufis* 'Hundestall; Abteilung im Stalle zum Aufbewahren des Viehfutters; ein altes Gebäude;' OS. *scap* 'Schaff, Bottich, Scheffel, Boot,' *skepil* 'Scheffel,' Goth. *gaskapjan* 'schaffen,' etc., root **sqab-* 'cut, hew: shape, make; hollow out.' Compare **sqabh-* in No. 55 and in Gr. *σκάφος* 'a digging; trench, ditch; tub; hull of a ship, ship, *'σκάφμη* 'hole, trench; trough, tub, bowl; boat,' etc.

40. OHG. *scopf* (and *scof*), MHG. *schopf* (*schof*) 'Gebäude ohne Vorderwand, Scheune,' LG. *schupp* 'Wetterdach,' OE. *scoppa* 'shed, booth,' NE. *shop*, Germ. **skuppa-*, pre-Germ. **squbu̯-*, perhaps formed as a rime-word to the preceding from the root **squ-* 'cover.' Or from a base **squb(h)-* 'cut, shape,' as above: Gr. *σκίφος* 'cup, can,' *σκυφίον* 'cup; skull.'

41. OSwed. *skuppa skoppa* 'springen, laufen,' Norw. dial. *skuppa* 'stossen,' MLG. *schuppen* 'stossen, fortstossen,' MHG. *schüpfen* 'in schwankende Bewegung bringen, stossen,' *schupfen* 'in schwankender Bewegung sein,' Germ. **skupp-*, pre-Germ.

**squb(h)u̯-*: Lith. *skubùs* 'geschwind;' Swed. dial. *skopa* 'hüpfen,' ON. *skopa* 'springen, laufen'; Goth. *-skiuban* 'schieben,' etc.

42. OHG. *scoph* (and *scof*) 'Dichter,' *scoph, scopf* 'Gedicht, Spott,' MHG. *schopfen* 'dichten,' MDu. *schoppen* 'spotten,' Germ. **skupp-* or **skupw-* pre-Germ. **squbu̯-*, also in Norw. *skopp* 'Schale,' root *squb-* 'vellere': OBulg. *skubati* 'vellere,' Pol. *skubać* 'zupfen, rupfen,' Gr. *σκύβαλον* 'off-scouring, filth, refuse,' *σκυβαλίζω* 'reject, treat contemptuously,' ON. *skop* 'Spott,' *skopa* 'spotten,' *skaupa idem.* Cf. No. 41.

43. OHG. *slipf* 'Ausgleiten, Fall,' *slipfen* 'ausgleiten,' MLG. *slippen* 'gleiten, gleiten lassen; einschneiden, schlitzen, zerreissen,' MDu. *slippen* 'slip; slit,' etc., Germ. **slipp-* or **slipw-*, pre-Germ. **slibu̯-*: Lat. *dēlibuere* 'benetzen; streichen'; *dēlībāre* 'abstreichen, abbrechen,' OHG. *slīffan*, MLG. *slīpen* 'gleiten, schleichen; schleifen, scharf machen.'

IE. *-pu̯-*: GERM. *-ff-*

44. OE. *maffa* 'caul,' 'Fetthaut um die Därme,' Germ. **mafwan-*: Lat. *mappa* 'napkin; signal-cloth,' probably a genuine Latin word: **mapvā.*

45. OE. *gaffetung* 'scoffing,' Germ. **gafwat-*: ME. *gabben* 'lie, scoff, jest, prate,' N.E. *gab, gabble,* ON. *gabb* 'mockery,' *gabba* 'mock, make game of,' MLG. *gabben idem,* MDu. *gabben* 'scoff, laugh in derision, pre-Germ. **ĝhəpu̯-* 'hiare': ON. **gafa* 'hiare' (pret. *gafði*), OE. *geaflas* 'jaws,' Bulg. *zĕpam* 'gähne,' Skt. *hāphikā* 'Gähnen' (cf. Persson *Beitr.*, 835). Cf. No. 49.

46. OHG. *laffa* 'palmula, extrema pars remi,' NHG. Swiss *laff* 'Löwenzahn,' Germ. **lafwō*: Lat. *lappa* (**lapvā*), Bulg. *lópuš* 'Klette': OHG. *lappo* 'Ruderblatt' (No. 51), OE. *læppa* etc., No. 2.

GERM. *-ƀw-*: *-bb-*

47. OE. *ebba* 'ebb, low tide,' *ebbian* 'ebb.' MLG. *ebbe,* OHG. *ippihhōn* 'zurückrollen': Goth. *ibuks* 'sich rückwärts wendend'; *ib* 'ab-' (cf. Brugemann, *Grdr.*², II, 1, 507), Gr. *ἐπί*, etc. The meaning of Germ. **eƀi* was perhaps influenced by **aƀ*, since IE. **opí* (: **epi*) would fall together with **apó.*

48. NE. *fob* 'a little pocket as a receptacle for a watch,' dial. *fub, fubs* 'a plump, chubby young person,' *fubby, fubsy* 'plump,

chubby,' NHG. Pruss. *fuppe* 'Tasche, die man an sich trägt,' *sich fuppen* 'Falten werfen, nicht glatt anschliessend stehen, von Kleidern,' Germ. **fuƀw-*:Ital. *poppa* 'Brustwarze,' Lat. **puppa, pūpus* 'boy, child,' *pūpa* 'girl; doll, puppet,' Lett. *pups* 'Weiberbrust,' *paupt* 'schwellen.'

49. ON. *gabb* 'mockery,' *gabba* 'mock,' etc. (No. 45), **gaƀw-*:OE. *gaffetung* 'scoffing.'

50. Icel. *kubbi, kubbr* 'stump, stub,' Norw. dial. *kubbe, kubb* 'block, stub,' ON. *kobbi* 'Robbe,' Dan. *kobbe idem*, NE. *cob* 'a roundish lump:nut, kernel or stone (of fruit), roundish loaf, ball or pellet of food for fowls; haycock; ear of wheat, cob (of maize); a young herring, bullhead, clam,' *cobble* 'a round stone,' *cub* 'whelp,' LG. *kobbe* 'spider,' NE. *cobweb* 'spiderweb,' etc., Germ. **kuƀw-*: OE. *copp* 'summit,' Icel. *kúfr* 'rundlicher Gipfel,' etc. (No. 11), and perhaps Lith. *guba* 'Schober,' Lett. *guba* 'Heuhaufen' (NE. *cob idem*), *gubt* 'sich krümmen, beugen,' etc. It is probable that the Balto-Slav. bases *gŭb-, gyb-, gub-* (Berneker I, 360, 366, 373) represent IE. **gubh-* and **ghubh-*. Here probably also MHG., NHG. *quappe* 'eel-pout':MHG. *kobe idem*. Or less likely *quappe*, Germ. **kwaƀwō-*: Pruss. *gabawo* 'toad,' OBulg. *žaba* 'frog.'

51. Swed. *labb* 'Pfote,' OHG. *lappo* 'Ruderblatt,' *lappa* 'niederhangendes Stück Zeug, Lappen,' MHG. *lappe* 'einfältiger Mensch,' LG. *labbe* 'Mund, Hängelippe,' NIcel. *labba* 'walk slowly, saunter,' **labw-*:OLG. *lappe* 'Zipfel eines Kleides,' etc., No. 2.

52. EFris. *libbe, libsk, libber(ig)* 'widerlich, ekelhaft, schmierig, klebrig,' *libb-söt* 'unangenehm süss, schmierig und klebrig süss, z. B. von Syrup, Honig, etc., from **lĭƀw-*:Lat. *lippus* 'blear-eyed,' Lith. *lipùs* 'klebrig.'

53. OHG. *rūppa, rūpa* 'Raupe,' NHG. dial. *ruppe, roppe idem*, OHG. *rūpba* 'Quabbe, Aalraupe' MHG. *ruppe, rūpe*, E.Fris *rubbe* 'Robbe,' Norw. *rubb* 'rope-end, stub or fragment of anything,' *rubba* 'rub, scrub; scale fish,' EFris. *rubben* 'rub, scratch, scrape,' etc., Germ. **ruƀw-*:Lith. *rupùs* 'nicht klein gemacht, grob (vom Acker), uneben, rauh,' *rupūžė̃* 'Kröte,' *rūpùs* 'besorgt,' *ruplė* 'die rauhe Borke an alten Bäumen,' *raupaĩ* 'Masern, Pocken, Aussatz,' Lat. *rumpo*, OE. *rēofan* 'break, tear,' etc. Cf. No. 3.

54. MHG. *rappe* 'Raupe, eruca,' *rappen* 'abraupen,' *rappe* (:*rapfe* No. 4) 'Krätze, Räude,' Germ. **raƀw-*:Pol. *ropucha* 'Kröte,' Gr.

ἐρέπτομαι 'eat, feed on,' ON. *rafr* (strip) 'Raff,' *refill* 'strip,' EFris., Du. *rafel* 'raveling,' N.E *ravel.*

55. ON., Norw., Swed. *skabb* 'Krätze, scab,' OE. *sceabb* 'scab,' NE. *shabby* 'mean, scurvy; of mean appearance, seedy, unkempt,' MLG. *schabbich* 'räudig,' Germ. **skaƀwa-*, **skaƀu-*:OE. *scafoð* 'what is shaved or scraped off,' OLG. *scavatho* 'Räude,' probably Germ. **skabu-þan-*, Lith. *skabus* 'sharp'; *skabù* 'cut, hew,' OE. *scafan* 'shave, scrape,' Goth. *skaban* 'shave,' Lat. *scabo, scabies.*

56. MLG. *schubbe, schobbe* 'Schuppe,' *schobben* 'die Schuppen von einem Fische entfernen,' MDu. *schobben, schubben* 'scheuern, schaben, kratzen,' EFris. *schubben idem, schubbe* 'Schuppe,' *schubbig* 'schuppig, schorfig, rauh,' Germ. **skuƀw-*:ON. *skýfa* 'schieben, stossen; abschneiden,' MLG. *schove* 'Fischschuppe,' *schoven* 'beschuppen, betrügen.'

GERM. *-m-w-*: HG. *-mm-*

57. OHG. *frammert, frammort, framort* 'vorwärts, ferner': **framwert; *heimmort, heimort* 'heimwärts': **heim-wert* (Braune, *Ahd. Gr.*, §109, Anm. 4); MHG. *giemolf* 'den Rachen aufsperrender Wolf from **giem-wolf* (*Lexer*):OHG. *giumo, goumo* 'Gaumen,' ON. *gymer* 'Schlund, Meer.'

58. Like these are OHG. *emmiz, emiz* 'fortwährend,' *emmizēn* 'immer,' *emmizīg, emizzīg, emezīc, emazzīg* 'beständig, fortwährend, beharrlich' (NHG. *emsig*), *emmizigēn* 'fortwährend, immer,' from **amwiz, *an(t)-wiz* 'recurring': **-wiz* 'going,' *taga-wizzi* (coming daily) 'daily,' *ar-wīzzan* 'go away.' Here *n* is first assimilated to *m* before *w* as in MLG., LG. *man* 'nur' from **nwan*, OS. *newan*, OHG. *niwan(a)* 'nichts als, nur'; MDu. *mare, maer*, Du. *maar* from MDu. **nware, neware, newaer.*

IE. *-dy̯-*: GERM. *-tt-*

59. Icel. *patti* 'kleines Kind,' Swed. dial. *patte* 'Weiberbrust, Zitze,' NE. *pat* 'a lump, as of butter,' Germ. **patt-*, pre-Germ. **padу̯-*:Skt. *badvam* 'Haufe, Trupp, ein best. grosse Zahl,' *badaraḥ* 'zizyphus jujuba, Judendorn,' *bádaram* 'Brustbeere."

No doubt other examples of this change occur.

IE. *-tu̯-*: GERM. *-pp-*

60. OHG. *fethdhah, fettah* 'Fittich,' Germ. **feþwaka-*:Lat. *impetus*, Gr. *πέτομαι* 'fly.' Compare the same ending in Gr. *πτέρυξ*

'wing': Lat. *pro-ptervos* '*προπετής*'; OHG. *fedarah* 'wing': *fedara* 'feather.'

61. OE. *scæþþa* 'nail,' **skaþwan-*: *sceaþa* 'nail,' *scaþel* 'weaving-implement,' probably **skaþula-* 'shaft, weaver's reed,' identical in form with Goth. *skaþuls* 'schädlich,' **skhətulo-* 'cutting, stripping,' *sb.* 'strip, Scheit.' Cf. Nos. 30, 76.

62. OS. *kledthe, kleddo* 'Klette,' OHG. *chledda chletta, chleddo chletto idem*, Germ. **kliþw-*: Lith. *glitùs* 'glatt, schlüpfrig' (primarily 'sticky'), Gr. *γλιττόν·γλοιόν* Hes.; Lat. *glis, -tis* 'humus tenax,' *glūs, -tis, glūten*, OE. *clīpa* 'poultice, plaster (for wound), *æt-clīþan* 'adhere.' Similarly OE. *clāte* 'burdock,' *clīte* colt's-foot' belong to a base **glid-* 'stick, adhere': Lett. *glídét* 'glatt, schleimig werden'; and OE. *clīfe* 'burdock,' OHG. *klība* 'Klette': OE. *clifian* 'adhere,' Serb.-Cr. *gl'b* 'Kot,' OBulg. *u-glĭběti* 'stecken bleiben.'

63. OE. *wiþþe* 'withe, bond; chaplet, crown,' *cyne-wiþþe* 'diadem,' OFris. *withthe* 'Bande, Fessel,' MLG. *wedde* (and *wede*) 'Strick, Strang, bes. von Weidenreisern,' Germ. **wiþwan-*: Lat. *vitta* 'band, fillet' (**vitvā*), Gr. *ἴτυς*, Aeol. *ϝίτυς* 'the edge or rim of a round body; the belly of a wheel; the rim of a shield; arch (of the eyebrows); rib,' *ἰτέα* 'willow,' Pruss. *witwan idem.* Notice that Lat. *vitta* is from an early gemination from **vitvā*, while *cappa* (No. 19) is a later assimilation from **catva, *catuā.*

64. OE. *stæþþan* 'stay, support,' *stæþþig* 'sedate, serious,' Germ. **staþw-*: OE. *staþol* 'foundation, base; stability; firmament, sky; position, place,' ON. *stǫðua* 'stop, check,' Lat. *statuo, status*, Lith. *statùs* 'steil; unhöflich, derb, grob.' Cf. No. 21.

65. ME. *laththe* 'lath,' OHG. *latta* 'Latte,' Germ. **laþwō.* Cf. No. 22.

66. OE. *moþþe* 'moth,' MHG. *motte, mutte*, Germ. **muþwan-*: **muttan*, No. 24.

67. OE. *smiþþe* 'smithy,' OHG. *smiththa, smidda, smitta* (and *smida*) 'Schmiede' may represent Germ. **smiþwōn-* (and in part **smiþjōn-*: ON. *smiðia* 'smithy'): ON. *smiðr*, gen. *smiðar* 'smith,' Germ. **smiþu-*.

FRANCIS A. WOOD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[*To be continued*]

STUDIES IN THE FORNALDARSQGUR NORÐRLANDA
—*Continued*

II. THE HERVARAR SAGA

2. *The bearing of version U upon the poetic portions.*—The copyist of a saga in his own language could, if so disposed, change in considerable degree the wording of prose material without greatly altering the essential content. He could for that matter even alter the content. In the case of poetic material such possibilities were, it is true, not absolutely excluded, but any alteration was much more difficult. Furthermore in oral tradition poetic material lends itself more easily to exact memorizing. The poetic portions of such a saga as the Hervarar saga are accordingly in some respects a more sensitive test of relationship than the prose portions. If the conclusions I have already reached[1] as to the mutual independence of the three versions (*U*, *R*, and *H*) are correct, the agreement of any two upon a reading as against the third should establish their majority reading as presumably that of the original common source, while conversely the excellence of a text constructed upon this principle would tend to confirm the idea of the mutual independence of the three versions. As showing that such are the facts of the Hervarar saga and that through recognition of them the text of the poetic parts is susceptible of decided improvement it is my purpose to list the main contributions of *U* to the verses. For the ready identification of the verses in question I shall first give the number of page, stanza, and verse according to the text of Heusler and Ranisch,[2] as this is doubtless on the whole the most generally accessible one and rests upon a careful comparison of the two versions *R* and *H*. Other editions are concerned with the single versions separately except the more recent one of Finnur Jónsson, who includes in his collection of scaldic poetry[3] the verses of this saga.

[1] *Modern Philology*, XI (1914), 363 ff. [2] *Eddica minora*, 1903.

[3] *Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning*, II, A, 221 ff., 242 ff., 291 ff.; B, 240 ff., 262 ff., 311 ff., 1914. The verses of the Hervarar saga are not of scaldic but of Eddic type, as Heusler and Ranisch have rightly insisted. The text of Vigfusson and Powell in *Corpus poeticum boreale* (1883) can hardly be used for our purpose.

This editor bases his text upon all the accessible material, but in an arbitrary rather than methodical way, and his "consideration" of *U* is "limited" and confined to the very imperfect Verelius edition. The reading first given will mostly be the original one as indicated by the majority agreement of two out of the three manuscript versions *H*, *R*, and *U*. The reading accepted by Heusler and Ranisch for the *Eddica minora* will be indicated by *E*, that of Finnur Jónsson in the *Skjaldedigtning* by *S*. The minority variants will follow the original reading. The cases given will be limited to those in which *U* by its agreement or approximate agreement with *H* or *R* definitely establishes the original reading and all such cases will be included, even where *E* and *S* have already chosen correctly. Minor points of spelling or ending will be omitted; they point in the same direction as those of greater consequence. For our purposes normalized spelling and the Sievers verse-types with the general principles of *bragarmál* will be taken for granted. For the first few stanzas lacking in *H*, but occurring in the Qrvar-Odds saga (*Q-O*) the latter will be used as the third member for checking instead of *H*.

56:8 *E S* (bracketed in *S* as not genuine); *R U* verses 1–4, 7–8; *Q-O* verses 1–6; *H* lacking.

63:4:1–3; 63:5:3–4; 62:2:5–8 *Q-O E; R U S* combined in single stanza in order indicated; *H* lacking.

62:2:7 *fullhugar U E; R berserkir* (belongs in next stanza); *Q-O S fóstbræðr* (metrically inadequate).

63:3 *R U E S; H* lacking (*Q-O* has verses 1–2 hopelessly corrupt; these are bracketed in *E* as not genuine).

63:3:3 *skulu U Q-O E; R S munu.*

62:2:1–4 *U Q-O E S* (bracketed in *S* as not genuine); *H R* lacking (its substance resolved into prose in *R*). The wording differs considerably in *Q-O* and *U* and both are obviously corrupt.

63:5:6 *orrostu heyja U Q-O* (so in most manuscripts of *Q-O* and accepted by Boer in his edition); *E eiga orrostu* (from a single manuscript of *Q-O*); *R S eiga nema sé deigr.*

63:5:8 *nema U Q-O E; R S eða.*

52:1:4 *miklar U Q-O; R E* (for Hervarar saga version) *S margar.*

52:1:6 *en á hlíð U Q-O E S; R ok en síða* (no alliteration).

52:3:1 *á foldu U Q-O S; R E* (in Hervarar saga version) *at fullu.*

52:3:2 *bú U Q-O* (some manuscripts of *Q-O* have *ból*); *R E* (in Hervarar saga version) *S tún.*

52:3:4 *láði U Q-O* (so the manuscripts of *Q-O;* not accepted by Boer in his edition); *R E S ráði.*

52:5:1–2 *Leiddumk en hvíta hilmis dóttir U Q-O S; R E* (in Hervarar saga version) *Hvarfk frá hvítri hlaðs beðgunni* (reading of the last verse uncertain and its meaning wholly problematical).

52–53:6–7 *R E S; U* has these stanzas in the reverse order, 7–6, which agrees with the relative order in *Q-O* where 7 occurs as 4 and 6 as 9. The order of *U* seems to me to give better sense than that of *R.*

52:6:7–8 *ef hún síðan mik sér aldri U Q-O* (thus most of the manuscripts of *Q-O*; Boer follows the slightly different reading of a single manuscript, *er vit síðan séumsk aldrigi,* and is followed by *E* in its *Q-O* version and by *S*); *R E* (in Hervarar saga version) *er ek eigi kem til Uppsala.*

88:1:3 *hefði U; R hún.* The common source was probably the abbreviation *h.* The reading *hún* has caused editors to eliminate the *t* of *fengit* (*U R*) as a corrupt negative suffix; this is also the procedure in *E.* With *hefði,* however, *fengit* is the perfectly natural participle. *S* has here accepted the *U* reading from Verelius.

88:2:2 (*ef*) *lítil eru efni U.* With the elimination of the *ef* this gives a good verse and good sense and is followed by *S* (from Verelius). *R* lacks the words following *lítil,* is metrically inadequate and gives no sense. *E* alters to *litlum* and combines with an alteration of the corruption of the first two words of the next verse to *af fréttum.*

88:2:3 *frækn U* (its form *frækinn* is the less common one and metrically not so good) *S* (from Verelius). This reading was conjectured by Bugge (*var frækn*) without reference to *U* (*Norrøne Skrifter,* p. 312, 1873), though as an afterthought he suggested *fremstr* (*op. cit.,* p. 369) which is accepted in *E* (*fremstr var*). *R of frétt* (manifestly corrupt).

89:5:2 *sem hraðast kunnir U; R hratast* (corruption for *hraðast;* cf. positive adverbial form *hratt,* or according to Bugge possibly to be read *hvatast,* which would be synonymous). There is,

however, no alliteration with the preceding verse *Bú* (*þú*) *mik at ǫllu* (*R*). Bugge (*op. cit.*, p. 313) had conjectured *bazt* for *hratast* and is followed in both *E* and *S* (*bezt* in *S*). As a matter of fact the corruption may well lie in the *bú* of the preceding verse. In the manuscript *u* the space for this verb had been left blank, some copyist perhaps not being able to make out a form which the copyist of *R* had misread as *bú*. A later hand had inserted in *u*, perhaps quite irresponsibly, *ertu*.

89:5:5 *satt U E S; R fátt* (gives no alliteration).

13:1:(1–4 footnote) *H U S; R* lacking, in *E* consigned to the footnotes as not genuine. The readings of *H* and *U* vary considerably, but evidently preserve with corruptions the half-stanza otherwise lacking.

13:1:5 *einn H U E; R S* lacking.

13:2:5 *elligar R U; H E S hraðliga.*

13:2:6 *vit skiljum R U; H E S heðan líðir.*

14:4 *H U E S; R* lacking.

14:5–6 *H U E S. R* has the order 6–5.

14:6:6 *lítit hræða R; U lítit saka* (*saka* metrically objectionable and manifestly a corruption); *H rekka líðna. E* and *S* follow earlier editors in altering to *líðna rekka.*

14:6:7 *rekka slíka R U; H E S skjótla skelfa.*

14:6:8 *ræðumsk fleira* (*við*) *R; U* (*ok*) *ræðum fleira; H E S skulum við talask.*

14:5 (footnote). The stanza of *H* relegated in *E* to the footnotes as not genuine is confirmed as genuine by *U* and also included in *S*. Its position in *H* is before stanza 5, but it was transposed in Petersen's edition (*Nordiske Oldskrifter*, III [1847], 17) to the position after stanza 6, which transposition has been generally accepted by later editors including Finnur Jónsson. As a matter of fact *U* has it in this correct position.

15:9:3 *megir meingjarnir U; R megin meingjarnir; H S megir at meinsamir; E megir meinsamir.*

15:10:10 *fela H U E; R S bera.*

16:11:8 *dauða menn R U; H E S menn dauða.*

16:12:1 *niðr* lacking *R U S; H E niðr.*

16:13:1 *Segir (þú) eigi satt méru; R Segir þú eigi satt; H Segðu einn satt mér. U* has here the right reading, its *segir* being confirmed by *R*, its *eigi* by *R*, its *mér* by *H*. *S* has the correct reading without referring to *U*. *E* has *Segðu eitt satt* (*eitt* suggested by Bugge, *op. cit.*, p. 216). The original verse was probably *Segira satt mér.*

16:13:5 *Tyrfing með þér H S; U Tyrfing með sér* (*sér* evidently a corruption for *þér*); *R Tyrfing* (rest lacking); *E Tyrfing hvassan.*

16:13:6 *trautt er* (to be read *trautt's*) *þér at veita H U S; R trauðr ertu; E trauðr ertu at veita.*

16:13:7–8 *arf Angantýs einga barni U* (the manuscript *u* has *einka* for *einga*); *R arf at veita einga barni; H arfa þínum einar bœnir. U* is the only reading that gives good sense, and is confirmed by *R* except the *Angantýs*, where the other two agree neither with it nor with each other. *S* refers to Verelius, but combines arbitrarily *eingabarni einar bœnir. E* has *arfa þínum einga barni.*

17:17:3 *hafa R U; H E S bera.*

17:17:4 *magni R U S; H E afli.*

17–18:18–19 *H U E S; R* lacking. In these two stanzas *U* has apparently in several places better readings than *H*, some of which (from Verelius) have been accepted in *S*, while *E* keeps the readings of *H* or alters them arbitrarily. However, as the matter cannot be checked by agreement with a third manuscript further discussion is omitted.

18:20:7–8. These two verses belong at the end of stanza 18, while the two at the end of 18 belong here, as evidenced by the agreement of *H* and *U* (accepted in *S*). *E* has altered on the basis of *R* alone (and the note of Bugge, *op. cit.*, p. 219), which has the two belonging at the end of 18 attached at the end of 20, with the rest of both stanzas lacking.

18:21:6 *moldar hvergi H U E S; R fyrir mold ofan.*

18:21:8 *í hendr nema H E S; U í hendr* (*at*) *nema; R í hǫnd bera.*

18:22:2 *ok í hǫnd nema R U; H E S ok í hendr nema.* The majority agreement of manuscripts stamping *U* as right in both cases is here entirely in accord with the poetic effect, which is apparently lost upon the editors of *E* and *S*. Angantýr doubts

that any maiden would dare take the sword in her hands. Hervǫr asserts her readiness to take it in one hand, answering not only the expressed doubt as to her courage, but also any possible implication as to her strength.

19:24:6 *buðlungr H U E S; R bragningr.*

19:25:3 *fláráð H U E; R S fullfeikn.*

19:25:4 *hví (þú) fagna skalt R S; U því (þú) fagna skalt; H hverju fagna skal; E hví fagna skal.*

19:25:5–8 *R U E S; H* lacking (occurring already in an earlier stanza, 17:16:5–8).

19:26:5 *lítt rækik þat R U S; H lítt ræðumz þat; E lítt hræðumk þat* (cf. Bugge, *op. cit.*, p. 221).

19:26:6 *vinr R U; H E S niðr.*

19:26:7 *hvat R U; H E S hvé.*

19:27–29 *H U; R* lacking because of loss of one leaf of manuscript. There is then here no possibility of checking by majority readings and discussion is omitted except upon one point. Stanza 27 is followed in *U* by an extra stanza which is apparently genuine. *E* makes no mention of this. *S* quotes it in the footnotes (from Verelius), but speaks of it as a doublet of 26. As a matter of fact the first five verses are very nearly a repetition of those of 22, the last two of those of 26. Repetition of this type is, however, common enough in Old Norse poetry and not lacking in this particular poem. It will be recalled that *H* had previously omitted a half-stanza (25:5–8) because it represented such a repetition (*H* was interested primarily in the riddle-contest and abbreviated the rest of the saga) and such was apparently the reason for the omission here. The stanza of *U* would be spoken by Hervǫr and would preserve the alternation of stanzas between the two speakers.

106:1:1 *Hafa vil ek dag U; R E S Hafa vildak* (the manuscript actually reads *vildag*); *H Hafa ek þat vilda.* As will be noted *R* and *U* are nearest each other. I suspect that *U* has the most nearly correct reading and that the verse should read *Hafa vilk í dag* (cf. the *í gær* of the following). Loss of the *í* led to the understanding of *dag* as verb-suffix instead of an independent word.

106:1:2 *þat í gær hafðak U; R þat í gær hafða; H es ek hafða í gær; E þat er hafðak í gær* (following Ettmüller, *Altnordisches Lesebuch*, p. 35, 1861); *S þats hafðak í gær.*

106:1:3 *vittu hvat þat var R E S; U vittu hvárt þat verk* (corrupt); *H konungr, gettu hvat þat var.*

107:5 and following. The three versions differ from each other in the number and order of the riddles. These variations call for separate treatment and will not be discussed here. The order followed is that of *U*, which involves an irregularity in the sequence of pagination from *E*.

114:21–22. The verses of these two stanzas are combined differently in the three versions: *U* 22:1–3+21:4–6; 21:1–3+22:4–6; *H* 21:1–3+22:4–5+22*a*:6; 22:1–3+21:4–5+22:6; *R E S* 21; 22. Apart from the question as to which riddle comes first *U* appears to have the arrangement of verses correct, 1–5 confirmed by *H*, 6 as following 5 by *R*.

114:21:4 *mǫrgum hafa manni H U; R E S mǫrgum mǫnnum* (*hafa* with next verse).

114:21:5 *komit H U E; R S orðit.*

115:22*a R U E S; H* lacking except verse 6, which occurs in place of 21:6.

109:8:5 *á helvega R U S; H E heljar til* (manuscript *helju;* cf. Bugge, *op. cit.*, p. 241).

118:31:3 *sáttir allir saman R S; U alsáttir allir saman; H E ok eru sextán saman.*

116:25:6 *ok fylgja (því) margir mjǫk R S; U ok fylgir margr* (incomplete and corrupt, but confirming *R*); *H ok rennr sem hann má. E* accepts Bugge's (*op. cit.*, p. 254) improvement of *H, ok rennr, er renna má.*

112:16:6 *skjalli H U E S; R skildi.*

112:16:6–7 *R U E. H S* have the reverse order 7–6.

117:29:2 *ǫsgrúa R U S; H E ǫsku grúa.* The latter does not give a good metrical verse; the former does, though it presents lexicographical difficulties.

108:5:2 *líðr R U E S; H ferr.*

115:23:2 *í brimserkjum U; R S í brimskerjum; H E brimserkjum í.*

108:6:5 *en við H U E S; R ok.*

109:9:4 *ókyrrir H U E; R S ókvikvir.*
116:26:5 *R U E S; H* lacking.
116:26:6 *sumum H U E S; R firum.*
116:26:7 *lófa R U E S; H lofða.*
116:26:8 *lík R U E S; H líf.*
118:32:2 *sólbjǫrgum á; U selbjǫrgum á; H E S* (Bugge, *op. cit.*, p. 360) *sólbjǫrgum í; R sólbjǫrg of á* (preposition *of* is poetic equivalent of *um*).
118:32:3 *verðung vaka H U E S* (*vaka* not clear in *U*); *R það ek vel lifa.*
110:12:7 *fram líðr R S; U fram gengr; H E ferr hart.*

The result of the comparison undertaken above is primarily a confirmation of that previously arrived at, that the *U* version of the Hervarar saga is independent of versions *H* and *R*. The natural deduction from this fact is that it must be used in establishing a critical text of the saga, and it can be seen from the above how far short the two attempts at a critical text of the verse portions have fallen from achieving adequately such a result. What is true of the verse portions is of course true also of the rest of the saga, and all previous discussions of its composition suffer from the failure to recognize the value of *U* in checking what is original in all the versions and what is later variant.

A. LeRoy Andrews

Cornell University

HERMANN KIRCHNER'S *SAPIENTIA SOLOMONIS*

Hermann Kirchner, of Marburg, adapted for the stage the *Sapientia Solomonis* of Sixt Birck in 1591 and in the same year falls, according to the Preface, the beginning of the *Coriolanus*.[1] As the *Sapientia Solomonis* was performed in June of that year and as the Preface to *Coriolanus*, dated *Idibus Aug. 1599*, says it was nearly eight years ago that he began the work, it would seem that the *Sapientia Solomonis* is the prior production.

The title-page[2] shows the origin and history of the piece. Scherer pointed out[3] the fact that the interpolation of the comic scenes was from Frischlin's *Rebecca*. Keller refers[4] to the performance of a modified version of Birck's *Sapientia Solomonis* in England before Queen Elizabeth (at Oxford or Cambridge) in 1565 or 1566. As far as I have been able to learn we do not know of any performance of this play of Birck's in Germany up to the one of Kirchner's version in Marburg in 1591. The existence of a printed copy of the play before this adaptation by Kirchner was unknown to Goedeke. It is well known now that it is included in the *Dramata Sacra, Comoediae atque tragoediae aliquot e Veteri Testamento desumptae* (Basileae, 1547).

Kirchner's Preface gives some information about the history of the adaptation. It opens with a general argument in favor of the drama as a source of pleasure to the eyes, ears, and mind, as well as a source of various kinds of profit. The school drama is not merely a diversion but a prelude or preparation for the pulpit, the teacher's desk, and the tribune in public life and in the courts; Cicero is said to have received valuable aid, as an orator, from the friendship and emulation of Roscius, the actor, and Demosthenes also received

[1] For an account of Hermann Kirchner and his *Coriolanus* (1591) see *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXXIII, 2 (June, 1918), 269–301.

[2] *Sapientia / Solomonis Dra / mate comicotragico / descripta olim / a Xysto Betuleio, / recognita nunc, aucta et exornata, aspersis / Frischliniani Gastrodis nonnul / lis salibus. / Extemporali opera, imo lusu succisivo, sub / festino actionis accinctu / Hermanni Kirchneri./ Symbolon Solomonis: / Vanitas vanitatum et omnia vanitas. /* Marpurgi 1591. The copy of the play in the Royal Library in Berlin is apparently the only one in existence.

[3] *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, on Sixt Birck.

[4] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XXXIV, 224.

benefit from the stage. The Preface contains also the dedication of the work to the rector, vice-chancellor, deans and professors of the university.

It is interesting to note what changes Kirchner made in adapting Birck's play to the performance in Marburg. The most of these were in the way of correcting Latin that was faulty in grammatical or metrical respects. In twenty-nine places such changes were made. Other alterations involve small changes in ideas, as changes in the prologue to make it conform more nearly to the norm of the Latin school drama, in giving the source of the play, exhorting the audience to keep silent and begging their favor for the piece; or when at the end of the Gastrodes scene Frischlin's line: *Nam herus nos expectat sub ostio* becomes *Nam venter non patitur moram;* or when the elephants which Birck had the Queen of Sheba bring with her are dispensed with by Kirchner. Several small and unimportant details are omitted for reasons which are not altogether clear: B. 43 (=Birck's play, p. 43), *Meroe canit Solomonta; quicquid Candaces / Dictamini patet, notique climata: / Et Aethiops*, etc. = K. 61 (=Kirchner's adaptation, p. 61), *Meroe canit Solomonta regem: praedicat / Et Aethiops*, etc.

Omissions, substitutions, and additions, by Kirchner, constitute the most important changes in the play. The choruses of Birck's play at the end of each act, usually in Sapphic stanzas and meters, paraphrasing parts of certain chapters of the Proverbs, fall out and in their places are put, in several instances, the comic scenes from Frischlin's *Rebecca*, in which the clown Gastrodes appears. These scenes are, however, further elaborated by independent additions of Kirchner, along with the addition of one new scene, either original or from a source not known to me. Thus after the *Argumentum*, just before the first act, there is omitted *Chorus, Ex Cap. / proverbiorum VIII Sub perso / na Sapientiae / Ode tricolos tristrophos, sicut illa Prudentia, / per quinquennia iam decem.* Also after Act IV, scene 5, is omitted *Chorus Ex Cap. Proverb. 9. eo genere quo est Horatianum illud, Solvitur acris hyems*, as well as at the end of Act V, scene 5, *Chorus, Ex nono cap. Proverb. ut illud Horatianum, Sic te diva potens Cypri*, and also at the end of Birck's play Kirchner omits the sixty-eight lines of the *Chorus Ex Psalmo LXXII. Quo veri*

Solomonis, Christi nimirum, sapientia et iustitia describitur; in quo absolute felicis regni status, quasi typo quodam depingitur versu Choriambico.

At the end of Act I, which Birck closes with a *Chorus, ex eodem* (8) *Proverbiorum cap. versu Choriambico,* Kirchner uses as scene 6 the scene between Gastrodes and Chamus in Act IV (scene 5) of Frischlin's *Rebecca.* In place of Chamus he has Syba and, not finding the scene in Frischlin long enough for his purpose, he prefaced it with sixty-six original lines, a monologue by Gastrodes in which the clown characterizes himself as a true parasite. By being so he has arrived *ad hanc adipem.* The court of Solomon is little to his taste. They worship there a new goddess,

> Deamque nescio quam (Temperentiam
> Vocant) adhibent suis, dum potant, poculis
> Tam modicis, ut vix primores labias
> Nedum interiores fauces nedumque utrumque latus
> Tingas: philosophis hanc libens relinquo sobriam
> Mensam, vapores qui cerebro suo timent,
> Aut delicatulis illis puellulis
> Quae fieri curatura iunceae student,
> Mei mei stomachi per Saciam hospites
> Non sunt.

He sees Syba coming to find him. The latter announces that Gastrodes is wanted by the soldiers at the banquet, which is just about to begin, but he must take care not to be seen by the master of the feast; otherwise he will be driven out. Then begins the scene as in Frischlin.

At the end of Act II, we have in Birck, *Chorus ex eodem* (8) *Proverbiorum capite, versu Sapphico* (*Illa ego prudens Sapientia, ecce*). In place of it Kirchner gives as Act II, scene 6, a scene from Act IV, scene 6, of the *Rebecca,* prefacing it, as previously, for the sake of introduction and connection with the story, with twenty-five lines of his own and stage directions. The same Marcolphus whom Birck used later in this drama in the comic parts is also brought in here in Kirchner's original scene—a comic encounter between Gastrodes, the glutton and winebibber, and the bully Marcolphus, in which the latter is dismissed with a blow on the ear. Then Sympota

(Ismael in Frischlin) comes, between whom and Gastrodes (as in Frischlin) there ensues a long conversation filled with incredible stories and exaggerations.

Between scenes 1 and 2 of Act III of Birck's play there is interpolated by Kirchner a dialogue between Justitia and Prudentia, of forty-three lines, which seems to be original with him:[1]

Jus.: Ego parentis dicor summi filia
Astraea, lances quae manibus, quae cuspidem
Sonti timendam tempero, quae regibus
Asto fidelis purpureis pedissequa,
Aulas tueor, domosque, et altas curias;
Per me tribunal, per me stat praetorium. . . . .

Adsis, soror, mecum regi, Prudentia,
Et sensa regis iudicantis dirige.

Prud.: Adsum Dei cerebro prognata, maximum
Mortalium donum, a Deo expetenda Olympico,
Mei expetita regis voto Davididis
Donis quem supra mortale ingenium veho,
Deisque parem facio videri omnisciis. . . . .

Kirchner puts this as scene 2, that is, between the announcement by the Praeco that Solomon is going to sit in judgment (scene 1 in Birck), and the presentation of the case of the women (scene 2 in Birck). Kirchner's original scene is in the nature of a chorus and is the only addition of his to the play which is not in the comic spirit. He seems in general to have aimed to fill with comic scenes the places he left vacant by dropping out the choruses of Birck and thus he worked, as did Frischlin, in the spirit of the age which was soon to witness, if it had not already done so, such mixtures of the serious and the comic in dramas, in the productions of Kyd, Marlowe, and Shakespeare, which the English comedians brought to Germany. As the *Rebecca* contained only two scenes in which Gastrodes appears, and as these two scenes were used in filling up the gaps of the first two acts of the revised play, it was necessary to turn elsewhere for the necessary humor. Marcolphus, formerly devil, had degenerated

[1] An adaptation of Birck's *Sapientia Solomonis*, played in 1565 or 1566 before Queen Elizabeth of England, preserved in the British Museum, has the allegorical figures, Justitia, Pax, and Sapientia, and in it, as in our play, the humorous element is amplified, especially the part of the clown Marcolphus. See Boas, *The University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914), p. 21.

in Birck's play to the rôle of clown or court jester, who with impunity jests even with the king himself. Kirchner supplies, whether original or borrowed I am unable to say, a scene in which he brings on the stage the original Marcolphus, Moloch Satanas himself. Before Birck's Act IV, scene 1, containing the story of Solomon's embassy to Hiram, king of Tyre, to ask for skilled architects to help in building the temple, is interpolated this new scene:

> Cacodaemon indignatur et ringitur, quod in nulla aulae parte haerere posit.
>
> Moloch Satanus solus.
>
> Opera hic mea frigent: frustra dudum hanc aulam circumcursito:
> Frustra laboro, et sudo: fumos frustra et ignes torqueo:
> Operam omnem, et vigilias perdo meas; . . . .

He fears Solomon, yet he cannot explain to himself why he does so. He will move all Acheron to accomplish the destruction of the temple and he believes that at some time it will fall before his lightnings and flames. Meanwhile he will endeavor to corrupt Solomon *per foeminas malas*. He retires in terror when he sees the priest Sadochus, of the next scene, approach.

In addition to these scenes, added entire, Kirchner enlarged, by interpolations, in several places the speeches of Birck's characters, carefully putting on the margin in each case the words: *Additamenta Kirchneri*. Thus (Act I, scene 1) five lines are added amplifying the military glory of Solomon's ancestors; in the same scene seventeen lines are added in further glorification of his wisdom; in the next scene twelve lines of Kirchner's are inserted to show that life is ruled by Jehovah and not by the Parcae, Fate, or Necessitas. Birck's trial scene, a favorite in his dramas, was not long enough here to suit Kirchner's taste, and in the statements of the women before the king he gives them each several more lines in which to continue their abuse of each other. When the king decides in favor of the rightful mother, Tecnophila, Kirchner adds a page to her exultations and rejoicings, in which she tells us that although her boy has no father it may not prove a hinderance to him as history has recorded many instances of boys of mean birth who became great; Thama's two sons became princes and Jephta was not injured

by the obscurity of his father. The best recommendation is inner virtue. After a lengthy conversation between Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, in which there is a tiresome amount of flattery, by the Queen, of the wonderful wisdom and riches of Solomon, Kirchner in a few lines of his own again introduces Marcolphus, who compares himself with the strangers:

> Ex Aethnae credo hos venisse vaporario
> Homines fuliginosos, o facies nigras!
> Suam quis illis elocabit filiam?
> Meam profecto nolim; quam primum hos videram,
> Speculum consului de mea pulchritudine:
> Video niveum esse me prae illorum coloribus;
> Libet superbire, et reliquos prae me contemnere. . . . .

This play was performed at least once and perhaps twice in Marburg. In the *Staatsarchiv* in Marburg there is entered in the *Marburger Cämerei Rechnung* the following item:

1591

> Uff gewohnliche Ehrenmahl und Gastunge geistlicher und weltlicher Herren und Rahten.
>
> iiii th. iii Sch. iii d. sind 3 Gulden 10 albus 6 Heller sind nach gehaltener Comoedi Salomonis den 14 Junii an Essenspeiz uffgangen, als der Cammerräthe etzlich neben ihren weibern bei Bürgemeister und Rath plieben.

Though this has no mention of the fact that the performance was a university function it does not on the other hand expressly state that it was a performance in the market place, as the following entry shows:

1598

Ausgabe verehrung an Gelt.

> 13 th. sind 10 Gulden dennen Burgern verehret, welche des Absolonis Tragoediam uffm Marck gespielet den 12 Octobris laut quittung 43,

in which case it was a performance in German, or particularly for the *Kammeräte* or *Bürgermeister* and *Rat*. The occasion for feasting might easily have been in connection with a university drama to

which the city officials were invited. Another entry is of interest here:

Rechnung des Marburger Universitäts Oeconomus.

1591

Gemeine Ausgabe

14 Gulden So Mag. Dns. Rector und Professores denen Magistris und Studiosis pro honorario decretirt welche eine Comoediam allhier agirt, und der löblichen Universitet dedicirt, Inhalt Befelchs hierbey, den 14 Augusti.

This probably refers to the same performance of the *Sapientia Solomonis* as the entry in the *Cämerei Rechnung*, or, possibly, to another performance of the same play. The date given here is merely that of payment of the bill and not of giving of the drama. Kirchner's adaptation, as we saw in the Preface, was dedicated to the university, that is, to the officers and professors of the institution.

It might be possible to conclude that the Latin performance of the play was held before the university authorities and that a German version of the same play, or the play of Joh. Baumgart, *Juditium, Das gericht Salomonis* (1561), or the similarly named drama of Hans Sachs, was performed later in the Rathaus or in the market place; or, the order of the performances in point of time may have been reversed. We know that it was usual to give several performances of plays in some such manner. Thus Baumgart, in the Prologue to the play we have just mentioned, tells of three kinds of performances: a "latein Aktion auf herrenmess" before the school authorities, a German one before the council in the Rathaus, and finally one for the people in the open, generally in the market place.[1]

In view of the fact that the only performance recorded of Birck's *Sapientia Solomonis* was that in England in 1565 or 1566, the question arises as to what may have induced Kirchner and his friends to select this drama for adaptation. It may have been because of the English performance before Queen Elizabeth that the drama commended itself to the court at Hessen, then especially friendly to England. This does not seem at all improbable when we learn that the Latin and popular drama of England was calling forth, it would seem, several imitations in Hessen just about this time. The

[1] Zellwecker, *Prolog und Epilog im deutschen Drama* (1906), p. 63; P. Exp. Schmidt, *Bühnenverhältnisse des deutschen Schuldramas* (1903), p. 45.

play, preserved in manuscript in Cassel, which Johannes Rhenanus wrote and dedicated to Landgrave Maurice in 1613, on the strife between the tongue and the five senses,[1] is a literal translation of the English play *Lingua*,[2] ascribed to Anthony Brewer. The *Grammatica*[3] of Isaac Gilhausen, to which in all likelihood the following entry in the *Rechnung des Marburger Universitäts Oeconomus* refers,

1600
Gemeine Ausgabe.

6 Gulden 4 albus an R'th'l'rn damit M. Gilhauszen als er eine Comoediam ufm Schloss gehalten inhalt Befelchs verehret den 2 Aprilis,

was written without any reference to the *Priscianus Vapulans* (1571) of Frischlin and, though for the most part an independent dramatization of Guarna's *Grammaticae opus novum* (1511), it is to be referred for comparison with the Latin comedy *Bellum Grammaticale*, which was represented on the stage in Christ Church College in Oxford before Queen Elizabeth on September 24, 1592, the author of which was the theologian Leonard Hutten. Bolte in his book on Guarna and the *Bellum Grammaticale* does not seem, however, to have investigated the relation of Gilhausen's work to the Latin comedy and no answer is given to Scherer's suggestion[4] that such a relationship may exist. Another possibility is that of the play of *Absolom*. As far as I can find out there existed no play of this title in Germany before that of the Magdeburger, Heinrich Roeteler,[5] of the year 1603. It is quite possible that the play of that name, which we have seen was mentioned in the *Marburger Cämerei Rechnung*, is an adaptation or translation of the *Absolom* referred to by Keller[6] as originating in England in Elizabeth's time.

JACOB N. BEAM
PRINCETON, N.J.

[1] *Speculum Aestheticum, d. i. eine schöne und lustige Comoedia darin alle Sensus, so wohl innerliche als äusserliche, sambt ihren eygenschaften und Instrumentum erclăret und gleichsam in einem Spiegel vor augen gestellt werden, neben einem lustigen Streitte, da die Zunge der sechste sensus zu seyn, mitt der fünff sensibus contendiret.*

[2] *Lingua, or, the Combat of the tongue and the five senses for Superiority: a pleasant Comoedie*, etc., 1607.

[3] *Grammatica. Das ist: Eine lustige, und für die Angehende Jugendt nützliche Comoedia, von den schlüssel aller Künsten, nemblich der Grammatica und jhren Theilen. Durch Isaac Gilhausium Marpurgensem* (Franckf. a.M., 1597).

[4] *Allgem. Deutsche Biographie.*

[5] *Goedeke*, II, 153, No. 394.

[6] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XXXIV, 229.

PROFESSOR PROKOSCH ON THE IE. SONANT ASPIRATES

In *Modern Philology* (Vols. XV–XVI) we have an excellent résumé of the problem of the sonant aspirates down to Ascoli's solution. For Ascoli's *bh*, etc., Professor Prokosch sets up voiceless spirants *f*, etc. (generally designated by the Greek aspirates *φ*, etc.).

Gondi-Burmese.—Sonant aspirates do not conform to any European habits of articulation,[1] and the type of articulation is rare. Outside of Sanskrit (including modern Indic vernaculars) sonant spirants are found only in non-Aryan Himalayan races, in Gondi, and in Burmese, all being tongues contiguous with Sanskrit. These neighbors may have infected Sanskrit with their articulation. This is our author's preferred explanation, though he stoutly insists that Sk. *bh* may have arisen by spontaneous phonetic process from IE. *f* >pre-Indo-Iranian *β* (sonant spirant, and so throughout this paper) >Sk. *bh*.[2] Readers not skilled in phonetics will be sure to follow our author in his personal preference for a Gondi articulation of the Sanskrit sonant aspirates. Now the Gondi are a Dravida stock (Turanian-Dravida, according to our author), and the Dravida tongues have no [certainly original] sonant aspirates.[3] So we have the suggestion of intercourse between Gondi and Burmese.

Here I cannot go with Professor Prokosch at all. Gondi speech is full of infections from Sanskrit or the Indic vernaculars. The oldest Burmese literature is a Buddhistic Pali literature and I feel bound to conclude that the Gondi and Burmese (and Himalayan) sonant aspirates are an infection from Sanskrit, Pali, etc., and that

[1] Europeans cannot now, without great effort, make fire with a drill, but once they must have done so as easily as any contemporary savage folk.

[2] In explaining the progression from *β* to *bh*—which fits nowhere into the progressive schemata in his § 14—the author partly follows Meringer in supposing a change from *β* to *bβ* by way of affrication, and thus expresses himself: "in this case the crescendo of the sound ('stopping' in the resonance-chamber) must first have affected only the beginning of the sound, while its off-glide must have been enunciated with mouth opened more and more, instead of with the narrowing characteristic of the spirants. This implies an older period of increased muscular intensity and a later of relaxed intensity in Sanskrit. Such a reconstitution of the physiological conditions is admissible, but susceptible neither of proof nor refutation. As it does not fit into a larger scheme the propriety of the reconstitution is not to be established."

[3] When the lingual articulation of Sanskrit is charged to the Dravida stock there is room for doubt. The older stratum of linguals arose by Fortunatov's law in reductions of IE. *lt*, etc., to *ṭ*, etc. There are also *ḍ*'s and *ḍh*'s of palatal provenience.

it was not the other way about; see *Encyc., Brit.* IV, 480, and Wackernagel, *Ai. Gram.*, I, p. xxxvii. It is then for our author to make it seem probable that Sk. *bh* systematically developed out of his *f* rather than that *bh* was inherited from Indo-European. It is also to be noted here that, in order to relieve the systematic difficulty in proceeding from IE. *f* to Greek *ph* (ϕ), Professor Prokosch sought, without finding, evidence for precursors of the Greek invaders who did not have the power, or at least lacked the habit, of articulating the surd spirants (*f*, etc.).

Because, I suppose, of the beautifully consistent tables that may be constructed for the Germanic sound shiftings Professor Prokosch, as will appear from the last footnote, is full of the desire to find consistent physiological progressions suited to the "genius" (as it used to be called) of the several tongues, and for this view he can—and does—particularly plead French warrant. He therefore presents, disavowing all claim of innovation, a scheme of phonetic change as due (1) to crescendo or diminuendo of the exspiration; (2) to muscular tightening or relaxation in the organs of speech (let us say to taut and loose articulation).

Against the doctrine of uniformity (uniform direction, consistency) of sound change in a language I lack phonetic skill to argue at large, but it may be worth while to recall a few instances where uniformity fails. Of the Germanic surd spirants *th* ($\theta\underline{b}$) *f ch* (χ) the last became *h* (the aspirate) in English, and to adult English lips *ich* (or *ach*) is pronounceable only after severe practice, while *th* and *f* remain easy. In German (I speak now of the articulation only), *th* is unpronounceable but *f* and *ch* are quite vocable. In Latin, in initial position, only *f* (<*f* and *th*) remains, while *ch* has become the aspirate (*h*); in the interior (I speak here of intervocalic position only), *f* and $\underline{b}$ (*th*) became *b* and *d*, but *h* remained intact. In Sanskrit, in all free positions, IE. g^1h (and g^2h before IE. *e*) becomes the aspirate (*h*),[1] and we also have the variants *dh/h*

[1] Herein our author sees proof of his contention for IE. (sonant spirant) *y* whence, with loss of sonancy (voice), *h*. My own practice in learning to articulate German *ich*, *ach* makes me quite realize the possibility of *y*>*h*—with scant change in articulation, chiefly relaxation of the glottis—but, unlike the Greek, true Sk. *y* (*i*) never yielded *h*; why, then, the harder construct *y*<g^1h? However, if we give full value to the author's doctrine that Sk. **jh* (<g^2h) must have yielded [*ǰj*], we may perhaps find therein a reason for *dh*<*ǰj*(*h*) +*t*. Or does *dh* exhibit a lisping of Indo-Iranian *ž*? Cf. OPers. *d*(*δ*) as a variant of *x*.

(see Wackernagel *Ai. Gram.*, I, §217*a*) and *bh/h*, though *dh*, *bh*, *gh*, are normal and thoroughly alive.[1] Again, in Sanskrit the assibilation of IE. $k^1 > ç$ (*ś*) was completed and remained intact, but we have $g > j$. In Old Irish we have $k^w > c$, $g^w h > g$, but $g^w > b$. Disregarding in part the intermediate stages, in Armenian, as in German (first sound shifting), IE. *bh* shifts to *b* and *b* to *p;* but IE. *p* shifts (through *ph*, the aspirate) to Germ. *f*, while in Armenian $p > ph$ yielded *h*,[2] though pre-Armenian *th* and *kh* remained intact. Surely this is evidence enough of unequal treatment of consonants of the same rows and columns (I refer to the tabular arrangements of the consonants).

And now to tabulate the results of Professor Prokosch's treatment, limiting myself to *bh* (his *f*).

Sanskrit.—IE. $f(\phi) > \beta > bh$ (*bh* is a sonant aspirate, possibly a Burmese articulation).

Greek.—IE. $f > ph$ (surd aspirate), written ϕ in Greek. (In German borrowings Lithuanian writes *p* for German *f;* Slavic writes *b*. The pre-Greek population may have lacked the surd spirants.)

Latin.—IE. *f* remains *f* (interior *b*).

The other tongues.—IE. $f > \beta > b$. (This change is due to increased muscular tension. The stage β assumed on account of necessary [?] assimilation processes. But $f > b$ is admissible, supposing very weak expiration with normal tension of the speech organs [articulation] and coincident "stopping" in the glottis and resonance chamber.)

As I understand Ascoli's theory we have:

Sanskrit.—IE. $bh > bh$. (Here I raise the question whether *h*, i.e., the aspiration, was voiced [*H*]. The assumption of *H* may perhaps make easier Bartholomae's law whereby IE. *bdh* [?*H*] is the product of *bht*. Or was IE. *bh* a whispered sound [see below]?)

Greek.—IE. $bh > ph$ (written ϕ) >late Greek *f*. (Here the only early change, shared by pre-Italic, is loss of voice.)

Latin.—IE. $bh > *ph > f$ (interior *b* in free position). (That Italic reached *f* a thousand years earlier than Greek offers not the

[1] Why is not the partially affected change of $dh > h$ a move in the same direction as the change of jh to h?

[2] Sometimes for *h* we find *y*, which Meillet regards as a precursor to *h*, but the introduction of voice (?) in *y* and its subsequent elimination in *h* is not clear to me.

least reason why both tongues did not reach the *ph* stage by the same vocal route. To state one difference between these tongues, Greek was a language of even stress [musical accent], Latin of comparatively violent stress [cf. *hospes* reduced from *hosti-potis*], and the written word, literature, had a great stabilizing influence—all that we know of the old languages is the written word—and Greek had literature long before Latin.)

The other tongues.—IE. *bh* (?>β)>*b*. (If *ph*>*f* is a most normal direction of change due to increase in the force of expiration, *bh* [which is but *ph*+voice, produced by tensing the vocal chords] should by the same token yield β [whence *b*].)

As Professor Prokosch found it convenient to assume that his IE. *f* tended dialectally to β it might likewise be assumed for Ascoli's sonant aspirate *bh* that there was a variation between *H* (voiced aspiration) and *h* (unvoiced aspiration). Then we should have Sk. *bh*<*bH*=*H*, Greek *ph*(φ)<*bh*, Italic **ph*(>*f*)<*bh*. For the other tongues I do not know whether *bH* or *bh* might offer the easier point of departure. Again, IE. *bh* may have had a "whispered" articulation (or variant). By way of illustration I take the dialects of middle Germany, whose people on going north are supposed to say *pirne* (like South Germans), but on going south say *birne* (like North Germans). From such a whispered *bh* may have come Sk. *bh*, but Greek (and pre-Italic) *ph*.

Bartholomae's law.—I find the new doctrine of IE. *f* instead of *bh* hard to reconcile with Bartholomae's law. Taking now for our example the dentals, *dh*+*t* yielded (*a*) IE. *ddh*. But often there was an inhibition of the law so that *dh*+*t* yielded (*b*) IE. *tt*. As a matter of fact, only the Indo-Iranian tongues fully exhibit the operation of the rule (*a*); its inhibition (*b*) is attested most clearly in contrast formations in Indo-Iranian, and at large in the other tongues. The inhibition of the law was due to resuffixation, as to which it is enough to refer to Bartholomae in *Gr. Iran. Phil.*, I, §§52, 3; 53. ii. In brief, the past passive participle suffix *to* was so full of, or so filled with, semantic significance that the *ddho* participles were remade as *d-to*>*tto* participles. This latter type of participle and *ti* derivative (Greek πύστις: Av. advb. *apaiti-busti* X Sk. *buddhi;* in Greek π for φ as in πεύσομαι) alone survives as a

formal category outside of Indo-Iranian. In Latin, however, a kind fate has left one absolutely unimpeachable example attesting the treatment of IE. *ddh* in interior position, viz., *crēdo:* Sk. *çrad-d[h]adhāti.* To this example Solmsen called attention in *IF.* Anz., 19. 30, where he was expressly debating the words *custos, aestas, hasta,* the very words to which Professor Prokosch appeals as exhibiting in their *st* the Latin sounds that should correspond to Sk. *ddh* (<IE. *dh*+*t*).

Nothing is more hazardous than to infer phonetic laws from morphological reconstructions; and nothing justifies us in attaching the abstract suffix *tāt(i)* directly to the root of Lat. *aedes;* whether we write *aidh-tāt(i)* or *aiθ-tāt(i)* we shall be but making an unsupported reconstruction, not entitled for one moment to rank with the realty of *credo* and OIr. *cretim* (on *t*<*ddh* see Pedersen, *Kelt. Gram.*, §§69, 51). For *aestas* and *hasta* Solmsen has shown a better way and has referred to the number of equally possible (and equally uncertain) explanations of *custos.*[1] At all events *credo* definitely eliminates Lat. *st* as the product of *dh*+*t*.

Grassmann's law.—In Greek *τίθημι* (and in Sk. *dádhāti*), by Professor Prokosch's own admission, the actual difference between *τ* and *θ* (*d* and *dh*) lies in the loss of the aspiration; cf. (but with *b* for *p*) *bitha* from *phitha* in Nyamwezi (see Meinhof, *Introd. African Lang.*, p. 67). In plain language, if Ascoli's reconstructions are correct, when successive aspirates were to be uttered in successive syllables each of these tongues lost the "puff" of its first aspirate, its overcharge of breath—by way of economy, to save the puff for the next. This seems a perfectly normal disposition of effort. It is much more complicated when Professor Prokosch explains the Greek change of *τh*(<*þ*) *τh* to *τ θ*(=*th*) as due to increased tension

[1] Gothic *huzds* (hoard)—but see Falk-Torp, *Norw.-Dān. Etymol. Wbch.*, s.v. "hose" —may genuinely represent IE. *kuddhos* (hidden) and so, as an isolated word, fall under Bartholomae's law (*a*). Also Lat. *nōdus* (knot) may be identical in its phonology (vocalism and gender as in *φόρτος*) with Sk. *naddha* (bound). The actuality of *dh* in the root *nedh* has been unduly questioned. It is attested beyond all doubt in *νόθος* (bastard); cf. for the semantics Sk. *bandhula* (bastard); also, with *us* suffix, Sk. *náhus* (neighbor) and dat. plur. *nadbhyás* (see Grassmann and the Petersburg lexica). In Sanskrit the alternation *dh*/*h* is far too common to be challenged in *naddhá*:*náhyati;* cf. particularly nom. *upānát,* acc. *upanáham* (scandal). The correlation (rhyme) of Lat. *necto* with *plecto, flecto* leaves it remote from Sk. *náhyati.* As for the root stage *ned,* I ascribe its de-aspiration to reduction forms *nd*(*h*), as in Greek *ἁδίκη* Lith. *nėndrė*: OIr. *nenaid*(nettle).

in initial position *conditioned of course on dissimilation* (italics mine). Similarly for Sk. *d*[*h*] *dh*.

Final summary.—The differences between Ascoli (as I understand him) and Professor Prokosch may be tabulated as follows. For the purpose of brevity the articulation of the aspirates (their aspiration) will be designated by the word "puff," of the spirants by the word "hiss."

Ascoli.—In Sanskrit, *bh*>*bh* (no change): Greek, *bh*>*ph* (loss of voice); Italic, *bh*(>*ph* [loss of voice])>*f* (puff>hiss); other tongues, (1) *bh*>*b* (loss of puff) or (2) *bh*>*β* (puff>hiss) >*b* (loss of hiss).

Prokosch.—In Sanskrit, *f*>*β* (gain of voice) >*bh* (hiss>puff; possible intruding [Gondi-Burmese] articulation invoked); Greek, *f*>*π* (loss of hiss) >*ph* (*φ*) (gain of puff; possible intruding non-Greek articulation invoked); Italic, *f*>*f* (no change); other tongues, *f*>*β* (gain of voice) >*b* (loss of hiss). Proof of intruding non-Indo-European articulation would twice be welcomed.

In another form we may represent the changes thus:

Ascoli			
bh>*ph*	*son. aspirate*>*surd aspirate*	loss of voice	2
bh>*b*	*aspiration lost*	loss of puff	1/0
?*β*>*b*	*son. spirant*>*sonant* stop	loss of hiss	0/1
ph>*f*	*surd aspirate*>*surd spirant*	puff>hiss	1
bh>*β*	*son. aspirate*>*son. spirant*	puff>hiss	0/1
Prokosch			
f>*β*	*surd spirant*>*son. spirant*	gain of voice	2
p>*ph*	*surd*>*surd aspirate*	gain of puff	1
β>*bh*	*son. spirant*>*son. aspirate*	hiss>puff	1
f>*p*	*surd spirant*>*surd* stop	loss of hiss	1
β>*b*	*son. spirant*>*sonant* stop	loss of hiss	1

Professor Prokosch has skill to show, none more, by what articulatory and expiratory movements putative *f* (etc.) could be converted into *bh πh;* and his desire to transpose backward into Indo-European the German phonetic habit, so to speak, is keen. But his arguments to prove for Indo-European spirantic, rather than aspirate, articulation are entirely inadequate to that end.

The writer does not claim—he would be the first to disavow for himself—skill in physiological phonetics. Perhaps that is why

he cannot realize, either in the original paper or in the accompanying rejoinder of Professor Prokosch, how the new theory achieves a gain over Ascoli's, even as regards phonetic streams of tendency (systematic phonetics). If the IE. phonetic system had no aspirates their introduction into Sanskrit and Greek implies in fact a cross-current in the original system. On the other hand, the passage of aspirates into spirants is phonetically simple and well attested in many tongues (cf. outlying examples in Meinhof, p. 61). The writer, for reasons of personal regard toward Professor Prokosch, could not have felt sarcastic intention toward him nor toward his scientific work; and he pleads not guilty to any form of speech in the least sarcastic.

EDWIN W. FAY

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

REPLY[1]

I am indeed thankful to Professor Fay for his detailed consideration of my article. That a scholar of his remarkable keenness, although dissenting from me, is so utterly unable to advance any valid arguments against my theory, is nearly as reassuring to me as its acceptance by others: Collitz (*AJPh.*, XXXIX, 415: "Professor Prokosch in my opinion is right in holding that the alleged voiced aspirates were originally, in all probability, unvoiced spirants"), Tuttle (see below), Lotspeich (*JEGPh.*, XVII, 168: a tentative approval of an earlier statement of my view in the Introduction to *Sounds and History of the German Language*, written in 1915).

Professor Fay seems to base his opposition on these cardinal points: (1) my suggestion of native Indian origin of Sc. *bh, dh, gh;* (2) my reference to the chronological contrast between the Latin and Greek developments; (3) my apparent neglect of irregular developments of certain sounds; (4) Bartholomae's and Grassmann's laws; (5) most of all, though by implication, the general principles of my method.

[1] This reply was submitted by Professor Fay over one year ago as part of his own article which appears in this number of *Modern Philology*. Professor Prokosch intended in view of the death of Professor Fay to withdraw his reply. It seemed best, however, in view of Professor Fay's view of the matter, to allow it to appear as originally planned.

S. W. C.

(1) Whether Sc. *bh, dh, gh* were of Dravida or Burmese origin or not is not essential for my theory; I thought I had stated this clearly enough in my article. Nevertheless, it was truly "welcome" (even though Professor Fay speaks somewhat sarcastically of my "welcoming" such things) when I received the following letter from Mr. Edwin H. Tuttle (North Haven, Conn.):

> I am sorry to find that you describe these sounds as being unknown in native Dravidian words. Evidently you lacked access to the more recent sources and trusted earlier writers who (like Caldwell himself) were not overstrong in phonology and who failed to distinguish clearly between modern Tamil and ancient Dravidian. Kanara and Telugu have native words with voiced aspirates. From Kanara *ombhattu* (10−1=9), Telugu *padi* (10) beside *padhnalugu* (14), *ebhhai* (50) and early Tamil *pahtu*, a variant of *padu*> **phato* (10), it appears that Dravidian possessed voiceless and voiced aspirates some two or three thousand years ago. Admitting that the reverted linguals of Sanscrit came from Dravidian we can safely say that the voiced aspirates may have had the same origin.

(2) The retarding influence of the literary language on the pronunciation of Greek ϕ, θ, χ is no convincing argument, for this influence makes itself felt chiefly in regard to the form of words and phrases, but has nothing to do with sound changes that are not indicated by the spelling; the symbols ϕ, θ, χ continued to be used, but their phonetic values changed, since nothing in these letters suggests any given pronunciation.

(3) The majority of the cases of apparently irregular phonetic development cited by Professor Fay I have explained on former occasions, especially in *JEGPh.*, XVI, 1 ff., and in *Sounds and History of the German Language.* Therefore (in order to save space) I may be permitted to restrict myself this time to the stubbornly dogmatic statement: There is nothing irregular in any of the instances quoted; all of them are perfectly in keeping with the requirements of their particular organs of speech and with the phonetic tendencies of their languages.

(4) Grassmann's law is not Indo-European, but took place independently in Greek and Sanscrit (Indo-Iranian). It throws no light whatsoever on the subject as far as early IE is concerned. Nor is Bartholomae's law IE, and I can, therefore, not accept Professor Fay's construction of IE. **kuddhos* (Goth. *huzds*). I cling to

IE **kuθ-to-* (or, if preferred, **kudh-*) and cannot detect anything improbable in the assumption that this became Lat. *custos*, while IE **kred-θō* (**kred-dhō*) became *credo*.

(5) These are details about which Professor Fay and I could easily come to an agreement, I am sure. But there is a more fundamental difference between him and myself concerning the very principles of linguistic method, and that is the fact that I am, in scientific matters, an incorrigible optimist, while Professor Fay looks with skeptical pessimism at an effort like mine which "*sucht den ruhenden Punkt in der Erscheinungen Flucht.*" I have stated my philological platform so often that, instead of a restatement, I prefer to quote this time from two scholars who have expressed the same views more clearly and forcibly than I am able to do:

Welchen Sinn haben alle die Tausende von Lautgesetzen, solange sie isoliert bleiben, solange sie nicht in höhere Ordnungen aufgelöst werden? . . . . Im Einzelnen müssen wir das Allgemeine finden lernen, und demnach ist auch die Erkenntnis einer Tatsache, welche das ganze Sprachleben beherrscht, von grösserer Wichtigkeit als die Erkenntnis irgendwelcher Erscheinungsformen (Schuchardt, *Über die Lautgesetze*, S. 36).

Une loi phonétique ne peut donc être reconnue valable que si elle est d'accord avec les principes qui régissent le systeme articulatoire de la langue au moment où elle agit. ... Tout changement phonétique peut être considéré comme du à l'action de forces intimes et sécrètes, auxquelles convient assez bien le nom de tendances. Ce sont ces tendances qui modifient sans cesse la structure du language, et l'évolution de chaque idiome résulte en dernière analyse d'un jeu perpétuel de tendances. ... La notion de tendance phonétique est plus exacte theorétiquement, et pratiquement plus féconde que celle de loi phonétique. Elle seule permet de déterminer avec précision la cause des changements phonétiques et d'interpreter scientifiquement ceux mêmes qui paraissent le plus rebelles à toute discipline scientifique (Vendryes, *Mél. ling.*, p. 116).

EDUARD PROKOSCH

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PA.

CALVIN THOMAS, 1854–1919

The death of Professor Calvin Thomas, of the department of Germanic Languages and Literatures in Columbia University, means the loss of one of the ablest scholars and teachers in the field of Germanics in this country. Born near Lapeer, Michigan, he acquired the elements of his early education in the common schools of his native state. His craving for knowledge and for an adequate preparation for successful work as a teacher led him to enter the Michigan State University, an organic part of the educational system of Michigan. Upon his graduation from that institution at the age of twenty, in 1874, he began a three-year engagement as teacher of Latin and Greek in the Grand Rapids high school. This work he relinquished for a year of philological study at the University of Leipzig. He was appointed in 1877 to an instructorship in German in his Alma Mater, a position which in the year 1886 became a full professorship. Here he organized and directed with marked success a department of Germanic Languages and Literatures. Few teachers ever commanded the admiration, love, and enthusiastic devotion of successive classes of students that were accorded Professor Thomas here and in his subsequent work.

In 1896 he accepted a call to Columbia University as professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, a position in which he continued to work effectively along lines already indicated by his activity in Michigan. Through the preparation of annotated editions of earlier and later German classics, including in 1892 the first part and in 1897 the second part of Goethe's *Faust*, through a standard systematic *German Grammar* in 1895, through his *Life and Works of Schiller* in 1901 and his *Goethe* in 1917, through a useful *Anthology of German Literature* in 1909, as well as through a brief *History of German Literature* in the same year, Professor Thomas has substantially increased and enriched the available means for studying the German language and literature in American schools and colleges.

The Committee of Twelve appointed in the year 1897 by the National Educational Association to prepare a report on college entrance requirements was, in the absence of satisfactory national standards of work in modern languages, assigned a task of real difficulty and of great importance. Whatever improvement in the teaching of modern languages in this country may fairly be ascribed to the report of this committee, published in 1899 and widely discussed in subsequent years, is due in large measure to the energy, insight, and tact of the chairman of the committee, Professor Thomas.

His interest in a gradual simplification of English orthography led him to identify himself closely with the spelling-reform movement in this country and to undertake studies reflected in twenty-six articles on the letters of the alphabet in the *New Standard Dictionary*, 1913.

Professor Thomas had been since the founding of *Modern Philology* in 1903 a member of its Advisory Board of Editors. Our journal has, therefore, an especial sense of loss in his death.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *July 1920* NUMBER 3

LA CALPRENÈDE DRAMATIST

It is my purpose in this article, not to stress the importance of a neglected author, but to give the results of an inquiry into the work of one who as a dramatist has hitherto roused the curiosity of several writers, but attracted the study of very few. M. Lanson has discussed some of his plays briefly in his *Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie française.*[1] Both he and M. Bernardin have criticized at some length his *Mort de Mithridate.*[2] But most critics have confined themselves to pointing out the novelty of his subjects.[3] I was attracted to La Calprenède not only by the fact that he based the plot of three plays on English history, but by his producing in the important period between the *Cid* and *Polyeucte* more plays than almost any other French author. A man of such well-recognized importance in the history of the novel deserves to be studied, if it is only to determine the quality of his early literary activity, for it was as a dramatist that he served his apprenticeship and acquired what reputation he had before the publication of *Cassandre.* He was hailed at his début by Mairet[4] as of such promise that he could be

[1] Published by the department of Romance Languages and Literature of Columbia University, 1917, Lectures XII and XXI.

[2] In their editions of Racine's *Mithridate.* Cf. for the former pp. 20–22 of his sixth edition (Paris, Hachette, 1909); for the latter pp. 5–11 of his fourth edition (Paris, Delagrave).

[3] Cf. H. Koerting, *Geschichte des französichen Romans im XVII. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 245; Abel Lefranc, *R.d.C.C.*, XIV, 582; G. Reynier, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, edited by Petit de Julleville (Paris, Colin, 1896–99), IV, 388.

[4] Cf. the *épître dédicatoire* to his *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne*, Paris, Rocolet, 1636, and his *Avertissement au Besançonnois Mairet* (1637), cited by Marty-Laveaux, *Œuvres de P. Corneille*, III, 74, 75.

named among the writers whom he opposed to Corneille. Two of his plays attracted enough interest to be re-written by later dramatists. His *Comte d'Essex* was praised by Thomas Corneille and by Voltaire. Toward the end of his career Molière advanced him 800 francs for a "piece de Theastre qu'il doit faire"[1] and, even though this may be considered a recognition of his fame as a novelist rather than of his dramatic skill, it is nevertheless a tribute from one who was at the time the chief appraiser of an author's ability to attract an audience.

The sources of information with regard to La Calprenède consist chiefly of his marriage record, the prefaces to his plays, several anecdotes told by Tallemant,[2] and items from Loret's *Muze historique*.[3] These were collected and amplified by Moréri,[4] Niceron,[5] the frères Parfaict,[6] and others. The conclusions of these biographers appear substantially correct, but I would change the date of La Calprenède's arrival in Paris and would add from his prefaces a little information that has been hitherto overlooked. His full name was Gautier de Costes de la Calprenède. The son of Pierre de Costes and Catherine du Verdier-Genouillac, he was born at the Château of Toulgoud, near Sarlat in the Diocese of Cahors,[7] probably about 1610. He is said by Moréri to have studied at Toulouse. He claims in the preface to his *Mithridate* that all the French he knew before leaving Périgord was what he had read in *Amadis de Gaule*. The sources of his plays indicate that he may have read not only Latin, but Italian and English. He was a cadet, possibly an officer, in the Guards and saw service in Germany, where he suffered from the famine.[8] Before leaving the army, he composed his first play,

[1] La Grange, *Registre*, p. 52, under March 12, 1663.

[2] Chapter CCCLXXII, Vol. VI, in the edition of Monmerqué and Paris (Paris, Techener, 1857).

[3] For July 12, 1659; March 31 and October 20, 1663.

[4] *Le grand Dictionnaire historique*, especially in the edition of 1732 (Paris, Coignard) under the title *Costes*.

[5] *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres* (Paris, Biasson), XXXVII, 235–43. This volume appeared in 1737.

[6] *Histoire du Théâtre françois* (Paris, Le Mercier et Saillant), especially V, 148 *sq.* This volume appeared in 1745.

[7] Cf. Jal, *Dictionnaire*, p. 307, and Moréri, *loc. cit.*

[8] Preface to his *Comte d'Essex*.

probably toward 1635.[1] If we accept this date, we must reject that of 1632, given by Moréri without proof, for his coming to Paris, as he tells us that he wrote the play a fortnight after leaving his province.[2] Tallemant[3] says that he was long "un des arcs-boutants du bureau d'adresse." La Calprenède asserts[4] that he was protected by the princesse de Guimené. He ultimately established himself at court, where the queen, complaining one day of her ladies in waiting, found that they were so absorbed by the story-telling of a certain young Gascon that they had no time for their work. She thereupon sent for La Calprenède and enjoyed at first hand his skill as a raconteur.[5] He is said to have become a "gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du roi."[6] His marriage in 1648 to a widow of considerable notoriety[7] and the circumstances of the latter portion of his life hardly concern us, as his last published play was written no later than 1642 and his literary efforts were subsequently devoted chiefly to the composition of his three lengthy novels.[8]

What is important for us is that "il n'y a jamais eu un homme plus gascon que cetuy-cy,"[9]—for it is he and not Cyrano de Bergerac who was the real representative of Périgord in seventeenth-century dramatic literature—that he was of noble birth, soldier and courtier as well as writer. Tallemant also relates that when La Calprenède was standing behind the scenes at the first representation of *Mithridate*, a friend called to him that his play was making a hit. "'Chut, chut' luy dit-il, 'ne me nommez point; car si le pere le sçavoit! Une fois,' disoit-il, 'que le pere, qui ne vouloit pas que je fisse de vers, me trouve comme je rimois, il se mit en colere, prit un pot de chambre, d'argent s'entend, pour me le jetter à la teste.'" The force of this anecdote is strengthened by the evidence of his prefaces, where

[1] Mairet, writing in January, 1636, *op. cit.*, speaks of this as a recent work. Grenailles (cf. below, *loc. cit.*) considers him to have been among the last of the new generation of dramatists. The play does not appear in Mahelot's *Mémoire*. Its privilege was not obtained till 1636.

[2] Preface to his *Mort de Mithridate*.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] Preface to his *Comte d'Essex*.

[5] Cf. Niceron, *loc. cit.*

[6] Cf. Moréri, *loc. cit.*

[7] Cf. Tallemant, *loc. cit.* Gossip made him out to be her sixth husband, but the marriage contract shows that he was the third.

[8] *Cassandre*, 10 vols. (1642–1645); *Cléopâtre*, 12 vols. (1647); *Faramond*, 7 vols. (*privilège*, 1658; left unfinished at La Calprenède's death).

[9] Tallemant, *loc. cit.*

La Calprenède assumes a disdain for the writer's profession that is remarkable in so voluminous an author. He is ashamed to be known as a poet. Writing is an "amusement que l'erreur du siècle rend presque honteux à ceux de ma profession."[1] If a nobleman excels in an art, they say, "c'est un ioüeur de Luth, c'est un musicien, c'est un Poëte." *Ieanne d'Angleterre* is a "mauvaise piece"; *Edouard*, "un ouvrage si mauvais et le dernier de cette nature que je pretends mettre au jour." He protests that he would not put his name even to *Essex*, his masterpiece, if it had not already appeared on worse plays, published in his absence and without his knowledge.

That he actually believed his work to be worthless seems improbable. He admits that his *Ieanne* was "cherement aimee." But he would be classified with soldiers and courtiers rather than with artists. His attitude is that satirized more than once by Molière. All that a noble wrote must have "l'air cavalier," and smell of no pedantry; he must compose without effort and without delay. La Calprenède's carelessness in matters of publication may be due to the same cause. His first play was printed largely in his absence, so that he had time to correct the proofs of the last act only. The documents authorizing the printing of this play and of the two that followed it were granted to the publisher, not to La Calprenède. He had so little to do with the publication of *Ieanne d'Angleterre* that his publisher thought him dead and referred to "feu M. de la Calprenède." He dedicated only three of his ten pieces and left one of them unpublished.

His plays may be listed as follows:

1. *La Mort de Mithridate*, tragédie (Paris, Sommaville, 1637); dedicated to the queen; *privilège*, Sept. 30; *achevé*, Nov. 16, 1636; first played probably in 1635.
2. *La Bradamante* (?), tragi-comédie (Paris, Sommaville, 1637); *privilège*, Feb. 7; *achevé*, Feb. 20.
3. *Le Clarionte ou le Sacrifice sanglant*, tragi-comédie (Paris, Sommaville, 1637); *privilège*, Feb. 7; *achevé*, Aug. 3.
4. *Ieanne Reyne d'Angleterre*, tragédie (Paris, Sommaville, 1638); dedicated by the publisher to the abbé d'Armentière.

[1] Cf. the prefaces to *la Mort de Mithridate*, *le Comte d'Essex*, and *Edouard*.

5. *Le Comte d'Essex*, tragédie (Paris, 1639); *achevé*, May 30, dedicated to the princesse de Guimené; Lyon, Claude de la Rivière, 1654.[1]
6. *Edouard*, tragi-comédie (Paris, Courbé, 1640); *privilège*, Feb. 23, 1639; *achevé*, May 10, 1640; dedicated to the duc d'Angoulesme.
7. *La Mort des enfans d'Herodes ou suite de Mariane*, tragédie (Paris, Courbé, 1639); *privilège*, May 15; *achevé*, July 2; dedicated to Richelieu.
8. *Phalante*, tragédie (Paris, Sommaville, 1642); *privilège*, May 3, 1641; *achevé*, Nov. 12, 1641.
9. *Hermenigilde*, tragédie (Paris, Sommaville et Courbé, 1643); *privilège*, Feb. 6; *achevé*, Sept. 10.
10. *Bellissaire*, played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, July, 1659;[2] not printed.
11. Play to be written for Molière.[3]

I. EARLY PLAYS

La Mort de Mithridate, following closely Mairet's *Sophonisbe*, interests us as one of the earliest tragedies composed by writers of Corneille's generation. It introduced its author to the dramatic world and gave rise to at least three anecdotes that evidence a certain notoriety.[4] Mairet[5] says of this play and Benserade's *Cléopâtre* that the "apprentissage est un demi-chef-d'œuvre qui donne de merveilleuses espérances des belles choses qu'ils pourront faire à l'avenir,"

[1] These are the only editions to which I have had access. The *Bibliothèque dramatique de Monsieur de Soleinne*, I, 255, declares that the play was reprinted at least five times. A copy of the Lyons edition owned by the New York Public Library is the only copy of any of the plays I have been able to find in America.

[2] Cf. Loret, *Muze historique* of July 12, 1659, and the frères Parfaict, *op. cit.*, VIII, 277–78.

[3] Cf. La Grange, *loc. cit.* The *Bibliothèque dramatique de Soleinne*, V, *supplément*, 25, attributes to him *la Lizimène* of G. de Coste, Paris, Thomas de la Ruelle, 1632, but as La Calprenède's name appears nowhere else in this form and as he tells us that *Mithridate* was his first play, this attribution seems incorrect. There was, moreover, a dramatic author named de Coste to whom Gaillard refers in his *Cartel, Œuvres Meslées*, 1634, pp. 33, 34.

[4] I have already cited one. Another, also from Tallemant, *loc. cit.*, tells us that "un jour qu'il avoit un habit d'une couleur bizarre, comme tout le monde estoit en peine de sçavoir quelle couleur c'estoit: 'C'est,' dit le feu Marquis de Gesvres, 'couleur de *Mithridate*.'" The same story in an apparently garbled form is told by Moréri, *op. cit.*, II, 450, with the substitution for *Mithridate* of *Silvandre*, a work otherwise unknown. It is also related that when the actor who played Mithridates at Epiphany swallowed the poison, saying "Mais c'est trop differer," a spectator in the parterre completed the verse with the words "le Roy boit, le Roy boit"; cf. the frères Parfaict, *op. cit.*, V, 160.

[5] *Loc. cit.*

and declares, the following year, that *Mithridate* has been played as often as any of Corneille's pieces. Grenailles insists that it "passe pour un chef-d'œuvre au jugement des habiles."[1]

The principal source is Appian. Plutarch and Florus are used to a smaller extent.[2] The subject is the death of Mithridates, as a result of his wars with the Romans and the desertion of his son, Pharnaces. According to Appian, the latter won over first the Roman deserters, then other soldiers in his father's army by representing to them the danger of invading Italy, as Mithridates was preparing to do. He was crowned king while his father "saw these things from a high portico." Unable to escape, Mithridates gave poison to his two daughters, who died at once, and took some himself, but, "although he walked about rapidly to hasten its action, it had no effect, because he had accustomed himself to other drugs by continually trying them as a means of protection against poisoners."[3] He accordingly persuaded Bituitus, an officer of the Gauls, to kill him.

La Calprenède lays the scene at Sinope, giving as a reason that it was one of the best towns of Mithridates' kingdom. Racine's location of it in the Crimea is more nearly in accordance with history. La Calprenède probably thought of Sinope because it was the town to which Pompey returned the body of Mithridates after he had received it from Pharnaces. When the play begins, the Romans, contrary to history, are besieging their enemy. The scene passes from the Roman camp to the palace of Mithridates, to the top of the wall between. Such use of a wall occurs in several plays of the period[4] and is condemned by d'Aubignac[5] on the ground that the wall must have been stormed during the progress of the play, yet the spectators, to whom it has been visible all the while, have seen no such event take place. Finally, a room in the palace is represented, cut off by a piece of tapestry that is drawn aside at the proper moment, according to a method noted in Mahelot's *Mémoire*.

[1] Cf. the preface to his *Innocent Malheureux*, cited by Bernardin, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[2] Cf. Appian, *Roman History*, Book XII, chaps. xv and xvi; Plutarch, *Pompey* and *Lucullus;* Florus, Book I, chap. xl. It is improbable that La Calprenède knew either Behourt's *Hypsicratée* (1604) or Margarit Pageau's *Monime* (1600).

[3] *Appian's Roman History*, translated by Horace White (New York, Macmillan, 1912), IV, 453, 454.

[4] Cf. Auvray, *Dorinde;* Scudéry, *l'Amour tyrannique;* Puget de La Serre, *le Sac de Carthage.*

[5] *Pratique du Théâtre* (edition of Amsterdam, Bernard, 1715), I, 92 and 219.

The first act introduces the two groups of persons whose conflict forms the struggle of the play. On one side are the Romans and their new ally. Pompey is present only long enough to discuss the ethics of Pharnaces' treachery and to hand over to him with surprising trustfulness the command of the Roman army. Within the town we see the other group, Mithridates and the women of his household. The second act is concerned chiefly with a last sortie of the besieged and a description of the mental state of Pharnaces, torn between the self-interest that has led him to the Roman camp and the love he feels for his wife, strengthened by a certain remorse at deserting his father.

It is with the third act that a more completely classical author would have begun his play. The sortie has failed. The citizens of Sinope surrender. Preparations are made to carry the palace by assault. The only hope for the king is to win over his son. Bérénice, wife of Pharnaces, who has remained faithful to her father-in-law, urges her husband from the top of the wall to abandon the Romans. After she fails, Mithridates, then his daughters and his wife try to persuade him, but in vain. The Coriolanus situation does not end in the triumph of patriotism or filial devotion. There is nothing left for the old king but to die and this he does magnificently in the last act, for which the rest of the play has been but a preparation. He and the four women of his family take poison in turn, but Mithridates continues to live while the others die one by one, for his system is so filled with antidotes that the draught has no effect upon him. This harrowing situation is made still more intense by the news that the Romans have broken into the palace. Mithridates now stabs himself, leaving the order that his pale corpse be placed upon the throne. Accordingly, when his son enters and the tapestry is drawn aside, he sees the bodies of Mithridates and Hypsicratée on the two thrones, those of his sisters and his wife at the king's feet. The effect of this spectacle is further heightened by the remorse of Pharnaces and the cynical calmness of his Roman companion.

M. Bernardin says of this tragedy: "Elle méritait d'être mieux écrite; car elle renferme une fort belle scène entre le père et le fils, le rôle de Bérénice est une création remarquable, le dénouement porte à son comble l'horreur tragique."[1] He goes on to point out

[1] *Loc. cit.*

the superiority of Racine's *Mithridate*, in which the true character of the king is preserved, though the details of history are not. I do not think, however, that La Calprenède should be taxed with too great fidelity to the records. He admits that he has altered his sources by laying the scene at Sinope, introducing Pompey, creating Bérénice, causing the king's wife to be present at his death, making of that death a suicide,[1] followed by the remorse of Pharnaces. Such changes as these are to the play's advantage and show already a freedom of attitude toward history that is characteristic, not only of his other plays, but of his historical novels. It is true, however, as Bernardin points out, that he fails to grasp the full dramatic value of Mithridates' character, for he gives only his noble side, his courage and patriotic hatred of the Romans, while his cruelty, his craftiness, which Racine depicts, are omitted, as well as his interest in music and Greek literature. As in Racine and in history, he is still a lover and a fighter, despite his advanced age, but La Calprenède fails to show by action the vigor of his character. The sortie is carried out behind the scenes. The interview with his son is inspired by the women. Only at the end do we see him acting with determination and there the effect is spoiled by the lack of forcible phraseology.

Mithridates is not represented as a tragic hero, who dies through his own error, but as a victim of his son's treachery and the strength of Rome. The dramatic struggle takes place in the breast of this son, who becomes the essential, if not the most emphasized, figure in the play. At the risk of improbability, La Calprenède gives him command of the Roman army in order that he may have the power to decide for or against his father. Love and remorse weigh upon him, but neither his wife's entreaties, his father's curse, nor the threats of his stepmother can win him over. The character is treated too unsympathetically to appear thoroughly dramatic. He is a villain rather than a man who, after weighing both sides, has come sincerely to the opinion that union with Rome is for the best interests of Asia Minor. The presentation of the problem is, moreover, anti-climatic, for his first interview is with his wife, who has most influence

[1] He gives as his reason for not having him slain, as in Appian, by the Gaul, the fact that such an ending had already been seen in two *Cléopâtres*. He refers, of course, to the plays of Benserade and Mairet, which had recently appeared. In both of these Anthony kills himself, but with the aid of an attendant.

upon him, the second with his father, the third with his sisters and step-mother. Here, as in the character itself, La Calprenède shows a certain power of dramatic conception, but with it a carelessness in detail that makes his work ineffective.

La Calprenède prides himself on the introduction of Bérénice and attributes the success of his play largely to the manner in which this rôle was interpreted by a great actress in the best troops of Europe. She makes indeed a pathetic and noble figure. So deeply does she feel her husband's treachery that she joins her fate to that of his father's family rather than profit by his betrayal of them. She pleads vainly:

> Si du bonheur passé le souvenir t'est doux,
> Élève un peu tes yeux, vois ta femme à genoux.
> Considère les pleurs qui coulent sur sa face,
> Et pour quels ennemis elle attend une grâce:
> Je parle pour tes sœurs, pour ton père et pour moi,
> Et bien plus que pour nous je demande pour toi.[1]

Bernardin points out the resemblance between this rôle and that of Sabine, for not only are the situations of the two women somewhat similar, but both are willing to suffer vicariously. It is by no means improbable that Corneille found here the suggestion for this character.

The other persons are of small importance. The two daughters are undifferentiated. The one member of Mithridates' harem brought upon the stage is Hypsicratée, a sort of Amazon who, according to Plutarch, accompanied the king in all his battles, dressed as a man. Although historically justified, the character possesses little human interest. The Romans are depicted according to tradition as stern and cynical men of affairs, strong and grasping, unaffected by sympathy or sentiment.

In spite of such errors as I have indicated, the play had much to recommend it to its audiences, the struggle in the soul of Pharnaces, the situation of Mithridates, the character of Bérénice, her interview with her husband, the meeting of father and son, finally the fifth act with its climax of tragic horror, equaled by few plays of the period. One cannot be overcritical of the "coup d'essai d'un jeune soldat," who knew of French only what he had read in *Amadis* and who could

[1] Cited by Bernardin, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

correct the printer's errors only for the fifth act. That the play remained on the boards for some thirty years is shown by its being listed in Poisson's *Baron de la Crasse* (1662) among the plays then popular in the provinces. It is important in the history of classical tragedy, as it may have suggested to Racine the subject of his *Mithridate,* to Corneille the character of Sabine, and as it is one of the first plays of its author's generation to depict the struggles of the Near East between the time of Alexander and the Roman conquest, a field that was to prove rich both for French tragedy and French romance.

Bradamante is attributed to La Calprenède by the frères Parfaict and the *Bibliothèque du théâtre françois.* De Beauchamps says that this tragi-comedy, "suivant M. de C., est douteuse entre lui et le duc de Saint-Aignan." No author's name appears in the printed play. The privilege was obtained by De Sommaville the same day that he received permission to print La Calprenède's *Clarionte.* The combat of an Amazon-like heroine would attract La Calprenède, but also a number of his rivals. There is no certainty that he wrote the play, but such evidence as we have points to him rather than to anyone else. If it is his work, it is his least original production.

The subject is the familiar story from the *Orlando furioso,* cantos XLIV–XLVI, which Garnier had dramatized over half a century before. Did the author base his play solely on Ariosto, did he follow Garnier alone, or did he make use of both? It would be difficult to prove that he did not turn directly to the *Orlando.* If confirmation of this statement is needed, it may be found in the scene depicting Léon's discovery of Roger and the latter's confession of his trip to the East, where La Calprenède follows details of the *Orlando* which Garnier omits.[1] On the other hand, he may have had suggestions from Garnier, whose play was frequently reprinted down to 1619. Evidence of such influence is not very strong, as both plays vary little from Ariosto's narrative, but the younger dramatist may easily have derived from his predecessor the idea of dramatizing the story and such details as the fact that in the duel between the lovers Roger presses Bradamante in the plays, though he only parries her

[1] Cf. *Orlando furioso,* XLVI, 26, ff.; *la Bradamante* (Garnier), V, 1; *la Bradamante* (La Calprenède), IV, 1–3.

blows in the *Orlando;* the planning of Marphise's stratagem in advance; the omission of Melisse's agency in the discovery of Roger;[1] the introduction of the comic element, especially in the rôle of Aymon.

Whether La Calprenède used Garnier or not, it is interesting to note by a comparison of the two plays the progress made in dramatic art during the half century that separates them. Garnier had omitted the chorus, but he had clung to the introductory monologue, the unequal distribution of matter among the acts, the excessive use of monologue and stereotyped dialogue, the lack of preparation for dramatic scenes that characterize imitators of Seneca. La Calprenède begins his play with the dialogue between Roger and Léon in which the former agrees to fight the latter's duel with Bradamante. He enters at once into the heart of his subject by omitting almost all the material which makes up Garnier's first two acts. Monologues, though retained, are not given to characters in whom we take little interest. The rôle of Beatrice is omitted and with it the farcical scene of the second act, which, depicting a domestic quarrel, must have seemed to La Calprenède out of place, even in a tragi-comedy. Dramatic preparation for the duel is more carefully made. The idea of bringing Léon and Bradamante together before the duel is original with La Calprenède. A still more decided change lies in the fact that this duel takes place on the stage, in the presence of Charlemagne and his court.[2] Garnier, on the other hand, does not show Bradamante in the presence of either lover before the last scene of the play.

The influence of the pastoral is seen in the description of the forest to which Roger retires after the battle, where he visits the "creux de ce rocher" and carves on a tree the statement that he has committed suicide. Interest is added to the last act by the addition of a scene in which the court awaits the return of Roger and by a comic ending that is not found in either of his predecessors. In his criticism

[1] Cf. *Orlando furioso*, XLV, 76, 103; XLVI, 20, ff.; *la Bradamante* (Garnier), IV, 1, 4; V, 1; (La Calprenède), II, 7; III, 1–2; IV. 1–3,

[2] One might think that, if Richelieu objected to the *Cid* on account of the duel, although it is neither acted on the stage nor approved by the king, much more would he have disapproved of this play, and that the fact that it was published anonymously might be due to this cause. I am not inclined, however, to press this point, in view of the frequency of duels in French plays of the period.

of Garnier's play Faguet[1] points out that the Bulgarian ambassadors constitute a *deus ex machinâ*. La Calprenède introduces them only once, after the king has acknowledged Roger to be the victor, an improvement over Garnier's method, but like the latter he uses their offer of a throne as a means of winning Aymon's consent to the marriage of his daughter and thus lays himself open to a similar criticism.

How far this tragi-comedy still falls short of the purely classical French play may be seen by comparing it with Thomas Corneille's *Bradamante*,[2] written a half century later. There the unities of time and place are preserved. Roger and Bradamante are brought together frequently before the end of the play. The spectacular duel takes place behind the scenes. The comic passages disappear. Superfluous figures, Renaud and Naymes, are omitted. Aymon and the Bulgarians, though figuring in the plot, are not seen on the stage. Even the rôle of *deus ex machinâ* is somewhat softened by having the arrival of the Bulgarians announced at the end of the fourth act. There is no evidence of influence exerted by either Garnier or La Calprenède on Thomas Corneille, who asserts that he draws his plot from Ariosto.[3]

A tragi-comedy called *le Clarionte ou le Sacrifice sanglant* was published the same year. Clarionte, a Corsican prince, and his fiancée, Rosimène, daughter of the king of Sardinia, are shipwrecked on the Island of Majorca, where the young man is condemned by reason of his beauty to be sacrificed to the sun. Rosimène and the daughter of the hostile king of Majorca offer to die in his place, while he insists they shall not, thus fulfilling the oracle's demand that the sacrifice continue till three fair victims contend for an honor whose prize is death. But the king will not release Clarionte until he is conquered by the latter's brother, who with his sister and an army arrive in time to save the hero both from the sacrificial block and the pursuit of the king's daughter, and to end the play in a triple marriage.

[1] *La tragédie française au XVI^e siècle* (Paris and Leipzig, Welter, 1897), pp. 218–19.

[2] Published in 1696. The author implies in his preface that he wrote it fifteen years before.

[3] M. Marsan in his critical edition of Mairet's *Sylvie*, Paris, *Société nouvelle de librarie et d'édition*, 1905, p. 231, notes that a line from La Calprenède's play, III, 4,

Amolliroient sans doute un cœur de diamant,

is an imitation of line 2048 in *Sylvie*,

Amolliroient-ils pas des cœurs de diamant.

The source of this tragi-comedy is unknown. The characters and incidents are those of many heroic or pastoral romances. The shipwreck, the sacrifice to the sun, the oracle are familiar to readers of Heliodorus. The woodland scenes, the carving on trees, the princess who hides in a forest, the *deus ex machinâ*, and the triple marriage are not uncommon in pastoral plays. The contest in generosity which gives the play its most distinctive feature has its parallel in various works of the period.[1] The most modern element in the play is the fact that the country has been ravaged by religious wars. The structure, as in *Bradamante*, is looser than that of La Calprenède's tragedies. There is nothing in the characters to distinguish them from the usual noble and beautiful heroes and heroines of tragi-comedy.

II. ENGLISH PLAYS

La Calprenède now returned to the field of his first success, historical tragedy, but sought in English history the source of his plots. The fact that he was attracted to the Tudors suggests that he aimed in his *Ieanne d'Angleterre* to re-write the *Ecossaise* of Montchrestien in much the same way as he may have re-written Garnier's *Bradamente*. In the *Ecossaise* he found not only a subject from recent English history, but the story of a Tudor queen who reluctantly condemns to death a captive princess on the charge of conspiring against her. In both this play and his *Ieanne d'Angleterre* the queen feels sympathy for her captive cousin; the council of nobles insists on the execution, the decision is reached between the acts, the condemned princess not only displays courage, but refers to her death as a happy event.[2] Instead, however, of merely adapting the older tragedy to the dramatic technique of his day, he selected a different event, the execution of Lady Jane Grey. The historical account was apparently known to him through Italian rather than English or

[1] Cf. Hardy, *Gesippe, Théâtre*, IV (Rouen, David Du Petit Val), 1626; Chevreau. *Les deux Amis* (Paris, Courbé, 1638); Du Ryer, *Clarigène*, Paris, Sommaville, 1639; Reynier, *Le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée* (Paris, Colin, 1908), pp. 78, 85. A somewhat similar contest between lovers, one of whom is to be sacrificed in order to avert calamity from a country, is found subsequently in Scudéry's epic, *Alaric* (edition of Paris, Loyson, 1673), pp. 54–63.

[2] Minor resemblances occur. The phrase "à gros bouillons" is used by both writers in describing the execution; "fay tomber le chef bas et voler l'âme aux cieux" becomes "le corps tombe sanglant et son âme s'envole"; in both cases the severed head bounces after striking the ground. Cf. *Les tragédies de Montchrestien*, edited by Petit de Julleville (Paris, Plon, 1891), pp. 108–10.

French sources.[1] He followed them particularly in the meeting of Mary and Norfolk at the Tower, the trial of Northumberland, and the execution of Jane and her husband. He omits certain important elements, especially the religious question and Wyatt's uprising. To have treated the first would have lost for his heroine the sympathy of his Catholic audience, while it would have been difficult to introduce Wyatt without destroying the unity of his play.

The tragedy begins just before the arrest of Lady Jane. With her husband and her father-in-law she is shut up in London much as Mithridates and his family had been besieged in Sinope. At the end of the first act, however, the two plots separate, for, while Mithridates held out to the end, Lady Jane and her relatives surrender and are placed in the Tower. The second act gives two *scènes à faire*, Mary's deliberation as to what shall be done with her prisoners and Lady Jane's interview with her in which she defends her *coup d'état* on the ground that Edward VI had left her the crown. In the third act La Calprenède gives the first example of his favorite dramatic device, the formal trial. Northumberland is arraigned before a jury of his peers, presided over by Norfolk, recently released from the Tower. The conditions of the trial are announced by the chancellor. The court rules, after Northumberland has made the plea, that he had acted in accordance with a statute of Henry VIII and that he should not be tried by men as guilty as he. Two of the lords reply to his accusation against them. His fate is left in Mary's hands.

After further consultation, the queen compromises between the general condemnation urged by Elizabeth and the pardon to which her sympathy for Lady Jane makes her incline, by condemning Northumberland and Guilford, setting free the former's daughters, and referring Lady Jane's case to the lords. As one trial has already been shown, Lady Jane's takes place behind the scenes. We learn in the fifth act that it has resulted in her condemnation. On taking leave of the warden, she gives him a "diamant," evidently considered

[1] He is certainly nearer to the account given by Pollini in his *Historia ecclesiastica* (Rome, 1594), pp. 250 ff. and 264 ff., and to Rosso, *Historia d'Inghilterra* (Ferrara, 1591), folio 6—folio 58, than he is to Holinshed, Grafton, Foxe, or De Thou. For example, the name d'Erby, given by the Italians to the warden, is used by La Calprenède, while in the English versions he is called Bridges or Bruges. Cf. Holinshed, *Chronicles* (London, 1808), IV, 23; Grafton, *Chronicle* (London, 1809), II, 543; Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (London, Pratt) (4th edition), VI, 424; de Thou, *Histoire universelle* (London, 1734) II, 414, 428–30. I have been unable to consult Michelangelo Florio, *Historia de la vita e de la morte de l'Illustrissima Signora Giovanna Graia*, 1607.

a more princely gift than the book with which she actually presented him. The play ends with a description of the heroine's death and the expression of the queen's remorse.

While a certain interest attaches to the men, the English lords engaged in trying the leader with whom they had recently conspired, the pathetic Guilford, the more forceful Northumberland, beaten, but still fighting desperately with his wits, one is chiefly attracted by the three princesses. Jane is the victim, first of her father-in-law, who forced her to accept the crown, then of her judges. She feels, even before her arrest, that she is doomed, though she warns Glocester that her power may return and argues with Mary in her own defense. There is reference to her "bel esprit," but little use is made of her dialectic ability. The necessary love interest is supplied by scenes that show her devotion to Guilford. Whatever qualms she may have felt at usurping the throne are not translated into action, for the play does not begin soon enough for us to see her at the moment of her choice. If La Calprenède could have introduced the religious motive, he would have better explained why she conspired and kept the character dramatic to the end, as Corneille did in the case of Polyeucte. He would also have strengthened his treatment of Mary and rendered her action toward Jane less hard to understand. As it is, Jane cannot struggle, while Mary's character lacks motivation. Her sister Elizabeth is the most Cornelian of the three. She is represented here from the Catholic point of view as a cruel and vengeful woman, unmoved by the fate of her enemies.

It is regrettable that this interesting subject, full of dramatic possibilities and appearing at a time when its example might have been widely followed, was handled by a writer who did not have the necessary stylistic and dramatic talent to make the most of it. The originality shown in the choice of subject, the sympathetic appreciation of both Mary and Jane, and the rendering of certain scenes are highly commendable, but the interest is scattered over persons whose actions are not sufficiently interdependent and the main action does not come near enough to filling the play. Jane's trial, if properly developed, might have supplied the lacking struggle, but it takes place behind the scenes. The third act is concerned entirely with Northumberland, while the fourth merely repeats the second. These

shortcomings may account for the play's lack of success, but credit must be given it for opening a new field and preparing the way for its author's *chef d'œuvre*.

This was the *Comte d'Essex*, a play that attracts our attention at once by the peculiar interest of its plot. The love of Queen Elizabeth for the Earl of Essex and her refusal to pardon him when condemned for treason formed, even without the romantic amplifications that were subsequently supplied, a dramatic theme that quickly found its way into various fields of literature.[1] Interest in the subject may have been enhanced for a French audience by the recollection that Essex had led the expeditionary force sent to aid Henri IV against the League. His execution had taken place in 1601, less than thirty-eight years before La Calprenède dramatized the event. The *Comte d'Essex* is the first place,[2] as far as I can ascertain, where the story appears that Elizabeth gave Essex a ring with the promise that any crime he might commit would be pardoned when he returned it, that, after his condemnation, he sent her the ring with a plea for mercy, but that the woman to whom it was intrusted did not deliver it till after the earl's execution. This legend, which received wide currency and has been accepted by some writers, even in recent years, as historical, occurs in several versions, inasmuch as the woman's failure to deliver the ring has been explained in various ways. As no one has attempted to describe how the story arose and how these versions are related to one another, I would offer a few suggestions in regard to them, which will show the importance of La Calprenède in the history of the tale.

The grounds for believing that the story is not historical are that none of the evidence for it is contemporary, that none of the several well-authenticated accounts of Elizabeth's death make mention of the incident, and that Essex said nothing about it at the time of his execution.[3] Yet La Calprenède's testimony shows that the story had already been formed some time before he wrote, apparently in

[1] Cf. Richard Schiedermair, *Der Graf von Essex in der Literatur* (Kaiserslautern, 1908).

[2] The *D.N.B.* cites nothing earlier than the middle of the seventeenth century. Ranke, *Englische Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1870), pp. 344–45, declares that it first appears in Aubéry's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Hollande* (1680). A Spanish play, *El Conde del Sex*, printed just before La Calprenède's, has an utterly different plot with no reference to the story of the ring.

[3] Cf. *Edinborough Review*, 1853, XCVIII, 161–65, and *D.N.B.*, XIV, 437, 438. The argument is weakened, but not materially, by La Calprenède's evidence.

English oral tradition. "Si vous trouuez quelque chose dans ceste Tragedie," he writes in his preface, "que vous n'ayez point leu dans les Historiens Anglois, croyez que ie ne l'ay point inuenté, et que ie n'ay rien escrit que sur de bonnes [*sic*] memoires que i'en auois receues de personnes de condition et qui ont peut-estre part à l'Histoire." The legend must have grown up partly out of an effort to reconcile the historical facts of the queen's affection for Essex and her signing his death warrant, partly out of some account of a ring given by a sovereign to a favorite in order to circumvent the law to his advantage. The first attempt at explanation is a statement, said to have been made by Elizabeth to the duc de Biron,[1] that, had it not been for the earl's pride, she would have pardoned him. But this was not satisfactory, for accounts of his death show Essex to have been almost unduly penitent on the scaffold. An undelivered message would easily explain this seeming contradiction. The use of a token under such circumstances was common enough practice. That this token should take the form of a ring previously given with a promise by the queen may have been determined by the fact that Henry VIII once gave a ring to Cranmer to enable him to appeal from his council to himself.[2] I can find no other story of a ring that would so readily have played a part in forming the Essex tradition.

In the earliest form of the story the only motive attributed to the person who prevented the delivery of the ring was probably personal enmity, for this is the only cause given in the version attributed to Sir Dudley Carleton,[3] but jealousy could easily be added, as is the case in La Calprenède's play. The difficulty of explaining how a woman who was in love with Essex could fail to deliver the ring probably suggested the addition of the third woman, found in the *History of the most renowned Queen Elizabeth and her great Favorite,*[4]

[1] *Histoires memorables*, 1607.

[2] The story is told by Cranmer's secretary Ralph Morice, whose manuscript was not published till it appeared in the *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation*, edited by J. G. Nichols, Camden Society, 1859, pp. 455–59, but it was used by Foxe and formed the basis of Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, V, 1–3. By this means Cranmer escaped punishment, an event which shows that the extraordinary thing about the story of Elizabeth's ring is not that she gave it to Essex, but that he failed to put it to use.

[3] Cf. Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, p. 1063 in the edition of Amsterdam (Bohm, 1720). The account is taken from Aubéry du Maurier, who declared that the story was told Prince Maurice by Sir Dudley Carleton, English ambassador to Holland. Essex is supposed to have given the ring to a relative, wife of Admiral Howard, who forced her to keep it till after the execution.

[4] This account appeared toward the middle of the century according to the *D.N.B.*, *loc. cit.*, and was followed by Francis Osborn in his *Traditionall Memories of Elizabeth*

according to which the queen, the Countess of Nottingham, and the Countess of Rutland were rivals for Essex's love.

La Calprenède formed his tragedy largely out of this legend, sprung, perhaps, from the union in the popular mind of a real event in the reign of Henry VIII and court gossip concerning the queen's love of the earl. To this he added details from Bacon's account[1] of the trial and execution of Essex, combining the original accusation of intelligence with the Irish leader, Tyrone, and the charges based on his subsequent attempt to seize the queen's person. He may not only have added the love of Lady Cecil and Essex for each other, but have identified Lady Cecil with the woman who prevented the ring from reaching the queen, for in other accounts other names are given her.

The play begins with an interview between Elizabeth and Essex, in which she charges him with treachery and urges him to confess, but he remains defiant and is soon arrested with his friend, Southampton. Already the psychological interest is introduced by a monologue in which Elizabeth wavers between her love for Essex and her duty to the country. The ring motive is prepared by the hero's dark hint that he has "des gages" which will prevent his disgrace. As subsequently in *Cinna*, the second act begins with a conference between the ruler and two advisers. Cecil urges severity, while Salisbury recommends justice. Before making her decision, Elizabeth seeks to induce Essex to humble himself and send her the ring. For this purpose she dispatches Lady Cecil to have an interview with him in prison. We now learn that Lady Cecil has been his mistress and that he has deserted her. When Essex sees her, his love returns, but he refuses to ask pardon for offenses against the queen that he denies having committed. The trial scene, already used in *Ieanne d'Angleterre*, is developed until it occupies the whole of the third act. Essex and Southampton are brought before the court over which Popham presides and of which Raleigh, Cecil, and Salisbury are members. Essex, far from showing contrition, attacks his enemies,

(1658), John Banks in his *Unhappy Favorite*, and many other writers. It is probably this *History* and its descendants that M. Reynier has in mind when he speaks of the sources of Thomas Corneille's *Essex* in his *Thomas Corneille* (Paris, Hachette, 1892), p. 171.

[1] *A Declaration of the Practices and Treasons Attempted and Committed by Robert, late Earl of Essex, and his Complices*, 1601; cf. *Works of Francis Bacon* (Philadelphia, Carey and Hart, 1842), II, 348 ff. There may have been an intermediate source, but it was not de Thou, whose account (*op. cit.*, XIII, 574–89) omits details found both in Bacon and La Calprenède.

denies his guilt, and boasts of his achievements. Southampton makes a more substantial defense, claiming that the letter to Tyrone is a forgery and that Essex's acts of apparent rebellion are merely efforts to resist his enemies. The court remains unconvinced by this plea and Popham condemns both earls to death.

But the queen pardons Southampton and delays the execution of Essex. The latter now begs Lady Cecil to take the ring to the queen. His declared motive is love of Lady Cecil, to whom he would confide his life and honor in order to convince her that he still loves her. Quitting the prison with the ring, she hesitates between her love of Essex and her desire for revenge. In this quandary she consults her husband and with him leaves the stage. Essex now enters, surrounded by guards who lead him to execution, just as Mariane had been led out in Tristan's play. He insists upon his innocence, sending word to Lady Cecil that he regrets the useless trouble to which he has put her. The news of his execution is brought to the queen, whose grief is restrained by the thought that she has put to death a traitor. But Lady Cecil summons her to her bed-side and, now at the point of death from remorse, confesses her relations with Essex and her husband's part in her failure to deliver the ring. Elizabeth swoons, then curses Lady Cecil, mourns Essex at length, and comments on her own approaching death.

The chief struggle of the play lies in the soul of the queen. When Essex intimates that he can control her, Southampton replies (I, 5):

> Le desir de regner estouffera tousiours
> Quelques ardeurs qu'elle ayt, le soin de ses amours.

It is the amplification of this couplet that forms the play. Once convinced of her favorite's guilt, she succeeds in stifling her love for him, but, hoping to find in his repentance justification for pardon, she makes every effort to induce him to send her the ring. She is a much more complex character than the earlier Elizabeth of *Ieanne d'Angleterre*. She differs from the Elizabeth of Thomas Corneille in that she is represented as an old woman,[1] that she has a real feeling of duty to the state, and that she is not at all jealous. The character is in keeping with the prevailing conception of Elizabeth,

[1] Cf. II, 5, "Qu'elle quitte l'amour, son aage l'en dispence." Voltaire, *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, Garnier, 1880), XXXII, 328, implies that Thomas Corneille's queen is also old, but the lines of his play do not make such interpretation necessary.

who constantly put the interest of England above the vagaries of her heart.

Essex is described as a haughty and unrestrained character, not unlike Rotrou's Ladislas.[1] His sarcasm suggests Nicomède. When brought before his judges, he arraigns them as follows:

> Donc Barons souuerains, donc Iuges equitables
> Qui pour nous occupez ces sieges redoutables, ...
> Arbitres absolus du destin de nos testes
> Sçauez-vous qui ie suis, sçauez-vous qui vous estes?
> Et bien qu'en vos faueurs mon destin m'ait trahy,
> Vous souuient-il encor de m'auoir obey?

Unfortunately the character is not represented with sufficient clarity. The evidence of his guilt is strong. His friend and he produce nothing to disprove it. Yet the fact that he never acknowledges his guilt, not even in private conversation with Southampton or Lady Cecil, must have outweighed with the audience the testimony submitted to his discredit, for d'Aubignac[2] praises the skill by which the spectators are brought to believe that Essex ought not to die: "Et plus on trouve de motifs pour croire qu'il ne doit point mourir, plus on a de douleur de sçavoir qu'il doit mourir." It is also not clear whether his preliminary refusal to appeal to the queen is due to fortitude or calculation. As soon as he has been sentenced, he gives the ring to Lady Cecil, saying that his love for her is the reason for his action, but as this devotion is not strong enough to save him from Lady Cecil's vengeance, it also fails to convince the reader. It remains possible to regard the hero either as the high-minded victim of political enemies or as a courtier who has sacrificed to his personal ambition his loyalty both to the queen and to his mistress. Either kind of character could be made dramatic, but the confusion of the two must, despite the critic's praise, have diminished the play's success. Thomas Corneille subsequently avoided the difficulty by generously whitewashing his hero. His Essex is not guilty of designs on the crown, is secretly married to the queen's rival, is obviously a victim.

Lady Cecil's is a dramatic rôle, but we do not see her enough to understand her actions. She still loves Essex and he has returned

[1] The passionate force of Rotrou's hero is attributed to the fact that *Venceslas* is based on a Spanish tragedy, but in Essex we have an earlier example of such a character on the French stage without there being any evidence of Spanish influence.

[2] *Pratique du théâtre* (Amsterdam, 1715), II, 125.

to her, yet she is so eager for vengeance that she yields to her husband's persuasion and allows him to be put to death. The manner in which she came to this decision needed to be explained, but, with a strange indifference to the *scène à faire*, La Calprenède put behind the scenes the interview between Cecil and his wife. The minor persons are unusually well characterized. Southampton is a friend whose devotion carries him almost to the point of threatening the queen.[1] Cecil and Raleigh, political enemies of Essex, are as cold and relentless as the latter is outbreaking. Popham is the high-minded judge, serenely indifferent to the passions of his associates.

One can understand why the play attracted enough attention to warrant Thomas Corneille's re-working it forty years later and Boyer's writing a play on the same subject. It is constantly dramatic, in that the fate of Essex hangs in the balance throughout almost the whole play. A queen between love and duty, a fascinating hero, a trial, the melodramatic story of the ring assured its success. I have pointed out certain shortcomings in the play. There is also unnecessary repetition. Strangely enough the two chief characters do not appear together on the stage after the first act. As time went on and Corneille's public became Racine's, the ring lost its charm, love attracted more than duty to the state, clearer exposition of character and greater respect for the proprieties were demanded. If we consider these facts, we can understand the changes that Thomas Corneille found it necessary to make. In his play the ring and the accompanying element of chance are omitted, the leading characters are changed as I have pointed out, the trial is reduced to a brief *récit*. Less interesting as an attempt to reproduce the past, Thomas Corneille's tragedy is clearer, more concentrated, in closer accord with the technique of his day. It is in this form that the play continued to be represented and read. La Calprenède's *Essex* suffered the fate of Molière's *Don Juan*, similarly re-worked by Thomas Corneille. But there has been no corresponding attempt to resuscitate this interesting play.

H. Carrington Lancaster

Johns Hopkins University

[1] IV, 3.

[*To be concluded*]

SOME *ROLAND* EMENDATIONS

It is well understood that the unstressed pronouns *me, te,* etc., do not regularly stand after a pause or begin the sentence in Old French, and that this is also true of the adverbs *i* and *en,* the position of all these words being that of enclitics, not of proclitics. It is intelligible that sooner or later they came to be used also as proclitics, and yet may have continued to preserve, and perhaps for a considerable time, the old position in the sentence. The words *Nen i ad cel* (*Roland,* 2545) may serve as a starting point from which it may be argued that this process began in the course of the twelfth century, if not even earlier, in the case of *i* and probably of *en.* I am here concerned only with the *Roland* as seen in the Anglo-French of the Oxford manuscript, and with the probable early form of the poem near the beginning of the twelfth century.

Neither *Nen i ad cel* (vs. 2545) nor *Cel nen i ad* (vss. 822 and 1618) can cause any difficulty as being peculiar; the form *nen* before a vowel is well enough known as old, and *cel* (or *icel*) is the normal original form of the accusative. But when we find *N'i*[1] *ad celoi* at the beginning of vs. 411 we may well pause to examine this and other instances of the impersonal expression with the negative and the pronoun *cel, icel,* or *celui.* Not that the shorter form *ne* does not often occur, and this before a vowel naturally becomes *n'*, but obviously *nen* is the older form, and one is tempted to restore *nen* whenever possible in this position in the *Roland* text, especially in this expression, which occurs so often as to give the impression of being one of the so-called epic formulas. That it is a formula—not necessarily an epic formula—or at least was in common idiomatic use, appears from the fact that it is found in *Alexis,* vs. 555, *Cel nen i at* (MS L has *Cel nen niat*), where Paris printed *Cel n'en i at* (so also in the edition of 1911); cf. also vs. 554, *Nul(s) nen i at.* For an example in continental Old French see Chrétien's *Ivain,* vs. 6132, in Foerster's edition, *N'i a celui, ne soit bleciez,* where the

[1] I print *N'i* for convenience; of course the manuscript has *Ni* (strictly speaking *N i*).

absence of *en* before *i* indicates that *nen* is to be preferred to *n'en* in the *Alexis* line as in the *Roland*, for this formula. At least it seems best to restore *nen* when *N'i* or perhaps *N'en* (the *en* from i n d e) occurs at the beginning of a *Roland* line. The negative, to be sure, in *N'i* or *N'en* still stands before the *i*, which does not technically begin the sentence, but *ne* is reduced to the consonant *n*, and the *i* (or *en*) makes in pronunciation with the *n* the first syllable of the line; phonetically considered *ni* is the first word. This means that if the sentence begins with *N'i* the *i* is really proclitic, and the case for *N'en* is similar. The grammatical terms "enclitic" and "proclitic" have no sense except as referring to pronunciation. Moreover in such a formula the fuller form *nen* is likely to have been longer preserved than elsewhere.

This situation—*N'i* at the beginning of the line—is presented in the Oxford MS for our formula in vss. 411, 1803, 1814, 1836, 3462, all of which show *N'i ad celoi*, easily corrected to *Nen i ad cel*, as in 2545; and in 1845 and 3540 *N'i ad icel*, readily changed to the same *Nen i ad cel*. In 3418 *Ne niad cel* is the MS reading. Stengel prints *Ne n'i ad cel*, but *Nen i ad cel* seems to be the true form. In 3805 *Neni ad celoi* is in the MS; Stengel has *N'i ad celui* but *Nen i ad cel* seems better. Including 2545 (and also 822 and 1618 in which *Cel* begins the line) we find twelve cases of our formula, ten with *Nen i ad cel*, two with *Cel nen i ad*, if my corrections are acceptable.

Should we take another step and change every line beginning with *N'i ad* or *N'en ad*, whatever word follows as the object of *ad*? Also we might notice a few cases not showing the impersonal *ad*. The following examples may be noticed: in vss. 22, 854, 960, *N'i ad paien*, one might read *Paien n'i ad;* in 290, *Jo i puis aler*, where Stengel has *J'i puis aler*, perhaps *Puis i aler* or *Aler i puis;* in 755, *N'i perdrat Carles li reis ki France tient*, perhaps *Nen i perdrat Carles* [or *li reis*] *ki France tient;* in 758, *Neni perdrat*, that is, *Nen i perdrat*, though Stengel's *Ne n'i perdrat* is also possible; in 810, *N'en descendrat*, possibly *Ne descendrat*, cf. 1751; in 1522, *N'i ad echipre*, perhaps *Nen est eschipre*, cf. 1555, *Beste nen est*, and 1733, *N'ert mais tel home;* in 1751, *N'en mangerunt*, perhaps to be changed to *Nes mangerunt;* or one might even think of *Ne 'n*, omitting the *e* of *en*

instead of the *e* of *ne;* cf. *sin* for *si en;* in 2467, *Il neni ad barge ne drodmund ne caland* should probably be read *Nen i ad barge ne drodmund ne caland;* though Stengel's *Il n'i ad barge*, etc., is admissible, yet the older form without *il* seems better; in 2522, *N'i ad cheval*, perhaps *Cheval n'i ad;* in 2753, Stengel's *N'en irat Charles* is very likely wrong; it would be nearer the MS if we should read *Et puis li dites: il n'en irat sem creit;*[1] cf. 1728, *Sem creisez* (where a small *e* is added after *Sem* and above the line in Stengel's printing of the MS); in 3169, *N'i ad Franceis*, perhaps *Franceis n'i ad;* in 3665, *N'i remeindrat*, perhaps better *Nen i remaint;* in 3789, *N'i ad Frances*, cf. 3169; 3908, *Nen recrerrai*, where Stengel prints *N'en recrerrai*, should not improbably be *Nem recrerrai;* for the reflexive pronoun cf. 3892, *car te recreiz.*

It is, however, unsafe to make all these changes outside of our formula solely because *i* or *en* appears to be proclitic, for the proclitic use may be even older. In the *Alexis* as edited by Paris (I refer to the edition of 1911 in *Les Classiques français du moyen âge*) I find, vs. 3, *S'i ert credance* (in the editions of 1872 and 1885 he read *Si ert*, etc., but in 1903 *S'i* appears); 138, *N'i remest paile;* 165, *N'en vuelt torner*, which is closely connected in sense with what precedes; 430, *N'i out si dur;* 556, *N'i vient enfers.* Not all these half-lines lend themselves readily to emendation, and this throws doubt on the changes suggested in the preceding paragraph for vss. 22, etc., in the *Roland.* Still, I look on all these cases in the *Alexis* with some suspicion of alterations by copyists.

E. S. SHELDON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

[1] This, it will be observed, avoids putting either *n'en* or an unstressed personal pronoun immediately after the caesural pause.

THE MADRID MANUSCRIPT OF THE SPANISH GRAIL FRAGMENTS[1]

A description of this MS was given by Morel-Fatio, *Romania*, X (1881), 300. Evidently without any knowledge of Morel-Fatio's description, Klob gave another in *ZrP*, XXVI (1902), 185. The following description is meant not so much to correct some slight mistakes of my predecessors as to supplement their statements.

The MS consists of three hundred and one numbered folios. Two successive folios bear the number 174, while f. 254 is followed by f. 256, though there is no gap in the story.[2] The last folio, numbered 302, should be 301. At the beginning there are four folios, all of them blank with the exception of about one-half of the verso of the last, where we read as follows:

¶ En este libro ay ocho tratados:
¶ El primero, que se llama flox sanctorum, que es libro de fueros de leyes I
¶ El segundo de la vida de Berlan e del infante Josafa XCIIII
¶ El terçero de la vida de los sanctos padres CCXIII
¶ El quarto del libro de Frey Johan de Rrocacisa CCXXXVIII[3]
¶ El quinto de Josep Abarimatia CCLI
¶ El sesto de Merlin CCLXXXII
¶ El septimo de los articulos e fe de los cristianos CCXCVI
¶ El octavo de Lançarote CCXCVIII

The Lançarote fragment ends on f. 300^{v} with this subscription:
Escriptus fuyt anno Domini M°CCCC°LXX. Petrus Ortiz.

There follow four folios; the last three are partly covered with scribbling; the verso of the first is blank, the recto contains this statement:

⟨f. 302⟩ En este libro son copilados onze tratados. ¶ El primero se llama libro del arra del anima. De como se rrazona el cuerpo con el anima e el anima con el cuerpo. E aun es llamado dialogo. ¶ El segundo de la vida de Sant Macario e de Sergio e Alchino. En como fueron ver su santa vida a una cueva cerca el parayso terrenal. ¶ El terçero de la vida de Berlan e

[1] This article is printed here, without change, as prepared in 1914 for publication in the series of the "Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur."

[2] I shall disregard the misnumbering in the present article.

[3] Should be CCXXXVII.

del infante Josafa. ¶ El quarto tratado de las vidas de los[1] sanctos padres. ¶ El quinto es de Frey Johan de Rrocaçisa. ¶ El sesto de Josep Abarimatia, e el qual libro es llamado del Sancto Grial, que es el escodilla en que comio Nuestro Señor Jesu Cristo el jueves de la çena con sus discipulos, en la qual escodilla cogio Josep la sangre del nuestro salvador Jesu Cristo. ¶ El VII. tratado[2] es llamado el libro de Merlin. ¶ El VIII. el libro de Tungano. ¶ El IX. de los articulos e sancta fe de los cristianos. ¶ El X. fabla de Lançarote e del rrey Artus e su mugier.

[1]	¶[3]Libro del arra del anima	I
	Libro de fueros, en [el] qual se con[tienen] quatro lib[ros][4]	
[2]	¶ Libro de la vida de Sant Macario	XXIII
	¶ Libro de la vida de Berlan e de Josafa	XXXIII
	¶ Libro de la vida de los santos padres	CLIII
	¶ Libro de Frey Juan de Rrocaçisa	CLXXVII
	¶ Libro de Josep Abarimatia	CXCI
	¶ Libro de Merlin	CCXXI
	¶ Tratado de los articulos e fe de los cristianos	CCXXXV
	¶ Tratado de Lançarote	CCXXXVI
[10]	¶ Libro de Tungano	CCXL
[11]	¶ Sermo Domini. Vocatum est nomen ejus Jesus	CCLXXIX
[12]	¶ Rreglas de la yglesia de Leon para rrezar	CCLXXXVII[5]
	E este libro se acabo Anno Domini M°CCCCLXIX.	
	Petrus Ortiz clericus.	

We have then three tables of contents, one, at the beginning of the MS, referring to it in its present state, and the other two referring to it in an older state.

Not to speak of some minor discrepancies between the last two tables, this much seems clear. The MS in its old state dates from 1469. For some reason, Petrus Ortiz omitted the first two texts mentioned in the second and third tables and substituted for them the *Libro de fueros*. He likewise omitted the last three texts, the Lançarote fragment thus becoming the last text of the MS in its new state. He finally added another subscription in which the word "Escriptus" has to be interpreted as "arranged."

[1] MS las. [2] MS tratato.

[3] The paragraph marks are canceled before ll. 1, 2, 10, 11, 12.

[4] A later addition. The scribe wrote *en los qual*, canceled *los*, but forgot to put in the proper word.

[5] These Roman numerals agree with an older pagination of the preserved parts of the MS (concerning Lançarote it should read CCXXXVII). These older numerals have been partly erased, partly not; they have also been used for a new pagination.

Further, a comparison of the pagination of the last table and that of the first shows that *La vida de Berlan* as well as the following texts down to *Lançarote* have been preserved in their original size.

As for the texts now lacking, Morel-Fatio identifies the *Libro del arra del anima* with the *Vision de Filiberto* (*ZrP*, II, 50). I suppose he decided for the prose *Visio Philiberti* as conforming better to the character of the MS than a poetic version of the *Contentio animae et corporis*. To me the words *arra del anima* seem to correspond better to Hugo of S. Victor's[1] *De arrha animæ*, Migne, CLXXVII, *c.* 951. The full title reads: *Soliloquium de arrha animæ. Interlocutores sunt homo et anima.* It is true, neither *soliloquium* nor *homo* fit the *dialogo* or *cuerpo* of the Spanish description. On the other hand, the probable length of the lost Spanish text (twenty-two folios) accords better with Hugo's work (eighteen cols.) than the *Filiberto* (eleven folios).

The *Libro de la vida de Sant Macario* was the *Vita fabulosa S. Marcarii Romani, servi Dei, qui inventus est juxta Paradisum, auctoribus Theophilo, Sergio et Hygino*, AA. SS. Oct. X, 566. The legend was little known (Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, I, 482). I have found no trace of another copy.[2]

The most recent writer on the *Libro de Tungano* in the Iberian Peninsula is probably Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela*, I (1905), CLXXXV. Strange to say, he speaks only of the Toledo, 1526, edition. From Salvá, whom he quotes, he could have learned of an earlier edition, Sevilla, 1508 (Bibl. Colomb.; cf. Gallardo, II, 530, 3257), and from Baist, whom he likewise quotes, of a "*Vision del Caballero de Ibernia* in Cod. Toled. 17, 6 ms s. XIV." Finally, of the Portuguese versions that Menéndez points out, the one in the National Library at Lisbon has been printed by Esteves Pereira, *Rev. lusitana*, III (1895), 97 (*Visão de Tundalo*), the other in the

[1] For Hugo of S. Victor in Spain, cf. Beer, *Handschriftenschätze Spaniens*, 467 (Tarragona), 513 (Urgel), 549 (Vich), 550 (*ibid.*).

A Catalan translation of *De arrha animæ* is mentioned by Morel-Fatio, Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 96 (=Beer, 531).

[2] Baist, Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 445, says: "Die Macariuslegende fand sich in einer Toledaner Hs., ebendort ein Tundalus und eine Übersetzung von *Berlan e Josapha*." I take it that two of his bibliographical notes have been mixed up here. His statement should read "Madrider" instead of "Toledaner" and have the additional remark: "ein zweiter Tundalus in einer Toledaner Hs." The footnote to this statement should read: "Roman. X, 300; Roman. Forsch. VII, 331; ZrP, IV, 318."

Torre do Tombo of the same city, by Nunes, *Rev. lusitana*, VIII (1903–5), 239 (*A Visão de Tundalo* ou *O Cavalleiro Tungullo*).

My efforts to learn something about the *Sermo Domini* and the *Rreglas de la yglesia de Leon para rrezar* have been unsuccessful.

To return then to the MS in its present state, it begins on f. 1, according to the wording of the first table of contents, with the *Flox sanctorum, que es libro de fueros de leyes.* Folios 1–2 contain the table of contents of the *fuero* of *Palençia* and *Sevilla.*

Begins: Este es el libro de las leyes, que es llamado flox sanctorum, XI capitulos.

Ends: Titulo del p(r)esçio de los navios XCIIII

On f. 2^{v} follows the *fuero.*

Begins: En el nonbre de Dios. Amen. ¶ Titulo de la fe catholica. Porque los coraçones de los onbres son departidos, por ende natural cosa es que los entendimientos dellos e las obras non acuerden en uno.

Ends on f. 94^{v}: E si algunos andaren en el navio que non troxieren sy non sus cuerpos, non sean tenidos de dar nada.

The lines quoted from the *fuero* correspond to *Fuero Real,*[1] 6 (beginning) and 161 *Ley* II (end). In the printed edition a *Título* XXV: *De los rieptos* concludes the work. But, according to a footnote, this *Título* in some MSS follows *Título* XX: *De las acusaciones e de las pesquisas.* The same order may exist in our copy. Considering further that our copy indicates ninety-four folios in contrast with one hundred and sixty-five pages of the printed edition, I should infer that the former is complete. It has not been used by the editors of the printed edition.

There are a few other points upon which I should like at least to touch. With the scant excerpts at hand, taken at a time when this portion of the MS interested me very little, I find it impossible to go into detail.

Aside from the form *flox* which will be discussed on another occasion, to call a *libro de fueros de leyes*, respectively *libro de las leyes, flox sanctorum* must appear strange. Now, the present text went by several titles: *Fuero real, Fuero de las leyes, Libro del Fuero, Fuero de los concejos de Castilla, Flores.* Thus *Mem. hist.*, II, 149. To

[1] *Opúsculos legales del Rey D. Alfonso el Sabio*, publ. . . . . por la R. Ac. de la Historia, II, 1836.

these I add from Marichalar-Manrique, *Hist. de la legislacion*, III, 17: *Fuero castellano, Fuero de Castilla, Flores de las leyes.* Evidently the careless scribe confused *Flos legum* and *Flos sanctorum.*

The title on the back of the MS reads: *Leyes de Palencia.* But the statement on f. 1 and the following passage that Morel-Fatio's more expert hand recorded: Nos Don Alfonso . . . entendiendo que la noble cibdat de Palencia e de Sevilla no ovieron fuero, . . . would make us believe that the present copy was destined to serve as *Fuero de Palencia e de Sevilla.* The result of my search in this direction is as follows. The *Fuero Real* was given by Alfonso X to Palencia in 1256, while the king was at Segovia.[1] It was given to many other cities a list of which is found in Marichalar-Manrique, III, 17.[2] Sevilla is not among them. The *fuero* of this city was the *Fuero Juzgo*, bestowed upon her by San Fernando in 1250.[3] How is the disagreement of those statements to be explained?

The printed *Fuero Real* is divided into four books. So is the present text, to judge from the last table of contents. But while the first book of the printed *Fuero Real* has twelve *títulos*, our text speaks of eleven *capitulos.* Perhaps the former has counted as *Título* I a *Prólogo* of the latter.

Finally, the heading: *Titulo de la fe catholica* is at a wrong place. On f. 94^{v} follows *La vida de Berlan e del infante Josafa.*

Begins: ¶ San[c]ti spiritus adsit[4] nobis gratia. Amen.
¶ Aqui comiença el libro de la vida de Berlan e del rrey Josapha de India, siervos e confesores de Dios. ¶ E de como el rrey de India martiriava los cristianos e los monges e los hermitanos e los segudava de su tierra. ¶ E de como se torno cristiano el rrey Josapha, e este mismo torno cristiano despues al rrey Avenir, su padre.
Parrofo primo: Segund cuenta Sant Johan Damaçeno, que fue griego muy sancto e muy sabidor, que ovo escripto en griego esta vida de Berlan e del rrey Josapha, en el comienço que (que) los monesterios se començaron a ser fechos . . .

[1] *Coleccion de fueros y cartas-pueblas de España*, por la R. Ac. de la Historia; *Catálogo*, 176.

[2] A smaller list in Schirrmacher, *Gesch. von Spanien*, IV, 533. The latter contains the name of Palencia that is wanting in Marichalar's list.

[3] Marichalar-Manrique, II, 488. According to Schirrmacher, IV, 420, it was "das Stadtrecht von Toledo."

[4] MS ab sit.

A few extracts may be welcome. I have chosen the *Trumpet of Doom*, the *Four Caskets*, the *Nightingale*, and the *Unicorn*.

⟨f. 111⟩ ¶ De lo que dixo el infante, e como rrespondio Berlan.

Quando el infante Josapha ovo dicho esto, rrespondiole Berlan muy mansamientre e dixo: "Bien lo feziste; ca asy conviene a cosa rreal e a señorio de rrey. Ca non paraste mientes a la mi baxeza, mas a la esperança de lo que asmaste que en mi yazia ascondido." ¶ Ca sepas que fue un rrey muy poderoso. E acaescio asy que yendo un dia en su carro muy onrradamientre, como convenia a tan alto rrey, e toda la su gente, que lo guardavan, yvan acerca del, e encontro dos onbres muy pobremientre vestidos con vestiduras muy viles. ¶ E anbos eran muy magros e avian las caras amarillas. E el rrey era muy sabio de todo bien e conoscio que por la aspera vida que fazian segund este mundo eran tan magros e avyan asi amenguado | ⟨f. 112⟩ las sus carnes. ¶ E descendio el rrey del carro e tendido en tierra estudo delante dellos e rrogoles que rrogasen por el a Dios. Despues levantose e dioles paz de todo coraçon. ¶ E los rricos onbres, que yvan con el rrey, non gelo tovieron a bien e dezian que aquello non convenia fazer a rrey. Pero non fueron osados de gelo dezir nin de lo rreprender dello. ¶ Mas dixieronlo a un su hermano del rrey que le dixiese aquella cosa, que avya fecho escarnio de la corona rreal. E el dixolo luego a su hermano, el rrey, que le non convenia fazer tal humillamiento como aquel. ¶ E el rrey rrespondiole mansamientre e dixole: "Non lo entendiste bien." E aquel rrey avia por costunbre que, quando el queria fazer justicia de alguno, mandava ante noche ante su puerta de aquel tañer una tronpa, que era ya deputada para aquel oficio. E los que la oyan luego la conoscian e entendian que avya de morir aquel a cuya puerta se tañia. E quando vino la noche, mando llamar el rrey aquella tronpa e mandola tañer a la puerta de su hermano. ¶ E quando la el oyo, fue muy espantado e desespero de la su vida e ordeno luego todas sus cosas. E quando[1] vino en la mañana, vestiose de vestiduras negras e fuese con su mugier e con sus fijos a la puerta del palacio del rrey [e] estudo y llorando con grand tristeza. E quando lo sopo el rrey, mandolo entrar. ¶ E quando lo vyo asi triste e lloroso, dixole: "Loco sin seso, e si tu temes el pregonero de tu hermano, a quien nunca erraste, por que rreprehendes a mi, porque salude humildosamientre los pregoneros del mi Dios, que me muestran a mayores bozes la mi muerte cada dia e me muestran la su venida muy espantosa, e he de dar cuenta de los mis males, que fago de cada dia? ¶ E tu non temas. Ca esto | ⟨f. 112v⟩ fiz por rreprender la tu nescedat; que paresce que mas temes la justicia mundanal, que poco dura e ayna pasa, que non la de Dios, que dura por sienpre. ¶ E yo se questo non se[2] levanto de tu cabeça, mas yo rreprendere a los que te lo consejaron, [e] yo

[1] MS quanto.

[2] MS le.

castigare la su locura." ¶ E por esta manera enbio el rrey castigado a su hermano.[1]

* * *

¶ De como el rrey mando fazer quatro archas de madera. En las mas fermosas puso los huesos podridos, [e] en las mas feas las [cosas mas] presciadas.

Despues mando fazer el rrey quatro arcas de madera. E mando que las dos fuesen llenas de vuesos de muertos, que fedian, e mandolos cobrir de oro e de muchas piedras presciosas e de specias e de muchas buenas olores. ¶ E las otras dos mando meter dentro las coronas rreales e otras piedras presciosas e de fuera mandolas cobrir de pez e de engrudo. ¶ E desque fue fecho todo esto, mando llamar sus rricos onbres, que entendia que avyan aconsejado a su hermano que lo rreprendiese del bien que avya fecho. ¶ E quando fueron en el palacio, demandoles el rrey quales vallian mas de aquellas arcas. Ellos rrespondieron que de mayor prescio eran aquellas doradas; ca sin dubda para guardar nobles cosas fue fecha tal obra. E estas otras negras e pegadas cosa de poca vallor devia yazer dentro. ¶ Dixo el rrey: "Tal es de vuestro juyzio; ca bien sabia yo la vuestra sentencia. Ca los ojos de fuera las cosas de fuera veen, e non conviene asy de fazer. ¶ Mas conviene con los ojos del anima ver las cosas abscondidas e spirituales, e veran los engaños de las cosas encobiertas." ¶ Entonçe mando el rrey abrir las doradas de fuera e cobiertas de piedras presciosas. ¶ E quando fueron abiertas, sa | ⟨f. 113⟩ lio tan grand fedor que lo non podian sofrir, e vieron cosa tan fea que la non podian sofrir. ¶ Dixo el rrey: "Esta es la semejança de los que estan vestidos de nobles vestiduras e dentro son llenos de fedor e de lixo e de peccados." ¶ Despues desto mando el rrey abrir las otras dos arcas que eran cobiertas de pez e de engrudo. E quando fueron abiertas, las cosas nobles que dentro yazian, alegraron los coraçones de los que las vieron. ¶ Dixoles el rrey: "Estas dos arcas son a semejança de aquellos dos onbres por que me vos fezistes rr[e]prender, que estavan vestidos de villes paños. E vos tovistelo por escarnio judgando la vestidura que ellos trayan vestida. E veyades las cosas de fuera e non veyades al. ¶ E yo por la su santidat echeme ante las sus caras, e yo con los ojos de dentro acatando la santidat de las sus almas tuveme por bienandante e por muy enxalçado, porque me tanxieron tan solamientre. Ca eran de mejor merescimiento ante Dios que todas las cosas presciadas deste mundo, que vienen ayna a fallescer." ¶ E asi castigados e confondidos de

[1] The present text represents a shortened version. It is derived from the *Speculum historiale* of Vincentius Bellovacensis. (So is *La estoria del rey Anemur e de Iosaphat e de Barlaam*, published by Lauchert from a MS s. XV in *Rom. Forsch.*, VII. But each translation is independent of the other.)

As for literature on the *Trumpet of Doom* since 1893 (Kuhn), I have incidentally noted: Lauchert, 342; Chauvin, III, 98; Köhler, II, 366; Gui von Cambrai, *Balaham und Josaphas*, h. v. C. Appel, 41, 1355; Herbert, *Romances*, 1910, 385 (*Speculum Laicorum*); Heuckenkamp, *Die prov. Prosa-Redaction von Barlaam und Josaphat*, 8, 33.

sus pensamientos vanos enbio los rricos onbres el rrey de su palacio, e non erraron contra el rrey de ally adelantre, mas pensavan las cosas, ante que las dixiesen nin las judgasen. ¶ E dixo Barlan al infante: "E tu bien feziste; ca segund aquel rrico sabio e rrey e piadoso rrescebiste a mi por la buena esperança que oviste, e non te salira vana la tu esperança, segund yo asmo."[1]

f. ⟨124ᵛ⟩ ¶ Del ballestero que era caçador e tomo el rruyseñor. E de como lo solto por los tres castigos que le dio.

Dixo Barlan: "Dizie aquel sabio que semejan los onbres que oran los ydolos al onbre vallestero que armava a las aves. E tomo un rruyseñor e quisolo matar. ¶ E el rruyseñor dio una boz, como si fuese onbre, e dixo: "Di tu, onbre, que provecho as de la mi muerte? Que aunque me comas, non inchiras el tu vientre nin mataras la tu fanbre. ¶ Mas, si me soltaredes darte he tres castigos que, si los bien guardares, sienpre averas dellos muy grand pro." ¶ Quando el vallestero oyo esto, maravillose e prometiole que, si le mostrase alguna cosa | ⟨f. 125⟩ nueva, que luego lo soltarie. ¶ Dixole el rruyseñor: "Pues nunca te esfuerces a tomar ninguna cosa de las que non pueden ser tomadas. ¶ E nunca te duelgas de la cosa perdida, si entiendes que nunca la puedes cobrar. ¶ E nunca creas lo que non es creedero. ¶ E guarda bien estas tres cosas, e sera bien de ti." E aquel onbre maravillose mucho del entendimiento de las palabras e solto el rruyseñor que se fuese. ¶ Quando el rruyseñor se vio suelto, quiso provar al onbre sy avya bien entendido aquellas tres cosas que rresçebiese dellas algund provecho. E començo a bollar por el ayre encima del e dixole: "O como fueste malaconsejado! Ay de ti, mesquino sin ventura, que oy perdiste tan grand thesoro! ¶ Ca si me tu mataras e me abrieras, e fallaras en las mis entrañas piedra preciosa que es mayor que un vuevo de estruçio." ¶ Quando esto oyo el caçador, fue muy triste en el su coraçon, e pesole mucho, porquel avya dexado asy yr al rruyseñor. E trabajose de cabo de lo tomar, sy podiese, e dixole: "Vente comigo para mi casa, e tenerte he muy vicioso e despues soltarte he muy onrradamientre." ¶ Dixo el rruyseñor: "Agora creo yo ciertamente que tu eres loco, porque creyste lo que non puede ser e non entendiste los castigos que te yo dixe nin los guardeste para aver dellos provecho. ¶ Ca yo te dixe que te non dolieses de la cosa perdida, desque sopieses que la non podries cobrar. ¶ E dixete que non provases por tomar la cosa que non puede ser tomada, e tu non puedes bolar por el ayre, como yo. ¶ Pues non | ⟨f. 125ᵛ⟩ ayas sperança de me tomar; ca en un dia yre yo do tu nunca me veas. ¶ Otrosi dixete que non creyeses lo que non puede ser, e tu creyste de ligero que en las mis entrañas avya piedra presçiosa tamaña como vuevo de estrucio. E tu viste muy bien que todo el mi cuerpo non es

[1] Cf. Lauchert, 343; Chauvin, III, 99; Köhler, II, 373; Gui von Cambrai, 44, 1449; Herbert, 398 (*Speculum Laicorum*); Heuckenkamp, 9, 20.

tamaño como huevo de gallina. ¶ Pues como cupo en el tu entendimiento que en las mis entrañas avya tamaña piedra?" [1]

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

⟨f. 132v⟩ ¶ Del onbre que yva fuyendo por miedo del unicornio e se subio encima del arbol.[2]

Dixo Barlan: Un onbre yva por un camino muy trabajoso. E paro mientes enpos de sy e vyo venir una grand bestia, que llaman unicornio, que lo seguya por lo tomar. E el onbre començo de fuyr, porque lo non matase. E fallo un arbor e subiose encima del por fuyr del unicornio. E llego el unicornio e estavalo aguardando; ca entendia que non podria mucho en el arbor estar. E el onbre puso los pies en una peña e teniase e paro mientes [e] vyo que tenia los pies afirmados sobre quatro cabeças de quatro culuebras. E vyo dos mures, uno blanco e otro negro, que non quedavan de rroer la rrayz del arbor. [E] estava plantado encima de la orilla de un poço, e pario mientes ayuso e vyo un grand dragon, que estava en el fondon del pozo con la garganta abierta asperando, quando caeria. ¶ E estando en esta coyta pensava que, sy los mures oviesen acabado de rroer las rrayzes del arbol, que el e el arbol caerian anbos en la boca del dragon. ¶ E si qualquier de las culuebras se ensañase e se tornasse a la cueva, non avria en que afirmar los pies e ca |⟨f. 133⟩ eria en la boca del dragon. ¶ E estando en este pensamiento paro mientes e vyo entre las rramas del arbol una colmena, [do] estavan panares de miel. E comio dellos e con aquel poco de dulçor olvido todos los males e los peligros en que estava. ¶ E acabaron los mures de rroer las rrayzes del arbol, e cayeron anbos en la boca del dragon, el arbol e el onbre. "Para mientes, infante, como es esto." ¶ El unicornio, que yva enpos del onbre, es el diablo, que sienpre lo sygue. El arbol, en que subio el onbre, es la vida deste mundo. Los mures, que le cortavan las rrayzes, es la noche e el dia, que comen la vida del onbre. Las quatro coluebras, sobre quien tenia afirmados los pies sobre sus cabeças, son los quatro humores, que mantienen los cuerpos de los onbres que, quando qualquier dellos se rrebuelve, non puede ser que el onbre non yaga enfermo. ¶ E el dragon, que yazia en el fondon del poço, es la muerte, que non podemos foyr. La colmena, en que estava la miel, es un poco de deleyte, en que los onbres viven (en este mundo) de comer e bever en este mundo. ¶ "Pues vees, infante, quanta es la mesquindat de los amadores del mundo e con que poca cosa engaña a los sus amigos."[3]

[1] Cf. Lauchert, 345; Grünbaum, *Jüdisch-span. Chrestomathie* (1896), 148; Hartmann, *Zeitsch. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde*, VI (1896), 270; Chauvin, III, 103; IX, 30; Köhler, I, 575, 580; Greenlaw, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, XXI (1906), 582; Gui von Cambrai, 67, 2241; P. Meyer, *Romania*, XXXVII (1908), 217; Herbert, 209; Heuckenkamp, 13, 1; Tyroller, *Die Fabel von dem Mann und dem Vogel in ihrer Verbreitung in der Weltliteratur*, Einleit. und erster Teil, 1912.

[2] In the margin: Nota exenplo.

[3] Cf. Lauchert, 349; Zart, *Zeitsch. f. d. deutschen Unterricht*, XII (1898), 735; XIII, 107; Chauvin, III, 99; Gui von Cambrai, 79, 2625; Heuckenkamp, 16, 5.

The *Vida de Berlan e Josafa* ends on f. 213:

> Acabase la ystoria de Berlan e de Josapha, segund que lo conto Sant Johan Damaçeno, que era griego. Dios por la su misericordia quiera a nos dar gracia e ayuda e fortaleza, porque merescamos de ser sus hermanos e conpañeros en la gloria de Dios padre con nuestro señor e nuestro salvador Jesu Cristo e con el spiritu sancto, aviventador de las almas. Amen.

Our text is of course noted in De Haan, "Barlaam and Joasaph in Spain," *Mod. Lang. Notes,* X (1895), 11, 69; Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes,* I (1905), XXXV, adds nothing.[1] The Portuguese version referred to by the latter and called "inédita todavía" was printed as early as 1898 by G. de Vasconcellos-Abreu (*A lenda dos santos Barlaão e Josafate;* I Texto crítico de um manuscrito que se lê no Códice do Mosteiro de Alcobaça existente com o n.° 266 na Tôrre de Tombo em Lisboa).[2]

K. PIETSCH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Yet one could have expected him to say at least a word about the *Libro del bien aventurado Barlan é del Infante Josaffá hijo del Rey Avenir, el qual fiso sant Juan damasceno,* formerly in the Gayangos Library, now in the National Library. Cf. *Catálogo Gayangos* por P. Roca, 1904, 231, No. 672.

[2] Two other parts, which are to deal with the language, the origins, and the propagation of the legend, are promised on the title-page, but to the best of my knowledge have not appeared.

[*To be continued*]

CABALLO DE GINEBRA

In Cervantes' *Entremés de la Guarda Cuidadosa* occurs the following passage:

Soldado: Pues ven acá, sota-sacristán de Satanás.
Sacristan: Pues voy allá, caballo de Ginebra.
Soldado: Bueno: sota y caballo; no falta sino el rey para tomar las manos.

In commenting upon this passage, Bonilla y San Martín,[1] after remarking that the sense of *caballo de Ginebra* is obscure, offers two explanations. First, he proposes that *Ginebra* be emended to *Gonela*. Gonnella was the court jester of the Este family, who rode the famous horse which was "only skin and bones," alluded to in the first chapter of *Don Quijote*. Second, he thinks that *de Ginebra* casts an aspersion of heresy, and illustrates his point by two quotations:

Tal fiesta allí se celebra,
que halla cualquier convidado
platos de carne y pescado,
como en viernes de Ginebra
[Ruiz de Alarcón, *La cueva de Salamanca*, II, 1].
Es como Ginebra el gusto:
sin leyes quiere vivir
[Lope de Vega, *Pobreza no es villeza*, III, 11].

In the later Schevill-Bonilla edition of this play,[2] the earlier note is reprinted with the addition of another allusion to Geneva as a nest of heresy, and also a quotation of two lines from a ballad describing a horseback journey of Doña Ginebra. These gentlemen therefore offer three mutually exclusive explanations: (1) Ginebra = Gonnella; (2) Ginebra = Geneva; (3) Ginebra = Guinevere. As for the first, an emendation should not be made if the reading in the text can be justified, as it undoubtedly can in this instance. The third lacks plausibility until it can be shown that Guinevere possessed a horse famous in song and story. Cervantes twice alludes to

[1] *Entremeses de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, anotados por Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín*, Madrid, 1916, p. 212. The translators offer no help on this passage.

[2] *Obras completas de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Comedias y entremeses*, IV (Madrid, 1918), 206.

Guinevere in *Don Quijote*, but the passages are not relevant to our text. Nor would it be pertinent to mention in this connection Ariosto's heroine, Ginebra, who figures so prominently in the fifth canto of *Orlando Furioso*. The second explanation is closer to the truth, but it elucidates very little. A single meaning for the phrase will not suffice. We are dealing with one of those *equívocos*, the despair of the modern commentator, so common in Spanish writers of the *siglo de oro*. Nevertheless it will not be necessary to refer the word to different etymons.

The dictionaries give the following definitions of *Ginebra:* Geneva, gin, confusion, a game of cards. Writers of the period offer examples of *Ginebra* used in all these senses.

Spaniards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries viewed Calvin's capital with holy abhorrence. Their feeling toward Geneva resembled our present attitude toward Moscow. Geneva was the center of revolutionary heresy triumphant. It was a city *sin ley* in the double sense of "without law" and "without religion." Its reputation as a center of disorder was gained long before the advent of Calvin. Under Calvin, Geneva was undoubtedly more orderly than it had been under previous régimes; but from the Spanish point of view there could be nothing lawful or praiseworthy in the rule of one who defied the pope. Thus, Vélez de Guevara's Limping Devil, on mischief bent, visits the two towns of Bertolina and Geneva and finds no work to do, "because their inhabitants are of themselves devils" (*El Diablo Cojuelo*, Tranco V). The following passage shows how Geneva typified to the Spanish mind a combination of heresy and confusion:

Los Dos:
El Amor y los Celos
partamos ésta,
pues son celos y amores
una Ginebra.
Vallejo:
Es verdad que les toca,
pues se parecen
en las confusiones
y en los herejes
[Quiñones de Benavente, *Baile de la casa de Amor*[1]].

[1] *Colección de entremeses, loas, bailes, jácaras y mojigangas, ordenada por Don Emilio Cotarelo y Mori*, II (Madrid, 1911), 475.

This being the feeling with regard to Geneva, the phrase *de Ginebra* readily became an abusive epithet (*apodo*):

Pedrosa: Sacristán de Ginebra, poco a poco
[Quiñones de Benavente, *Entremés famoso de la Antojadiza*][1]

The phrase undoubtedly carried with it an implication of heresy, as Bonilla thinks. It would be doubly insulting when applied to a churchman. While it may be rash to conclude from a single instance that it was an epithet commonly bestowed upon the much-despised sexton, if that be the case, no small part of the humor in the passage under examination lies in the fact that a sexton applies to a soldier an epithet more commonly given to his own class.

But Geneva also means "gin" in both English and Spanish; *de Ginebra*, therefore, meant not merely "heretical" but "drunken." In his well-known *Loa del Caballero del Milagro*, Agustín de Rojas Villandrando says:

Mas sobre todo, señora,
cautiva el alma en Ginebra,
[i.e., while I was intoxicated]
vine a dar, por mi desdicha,
en las manos de una vieja.[2]

And the same author writes, in his *Loa del cautiverio de la Rochela:*

Y un sacerdote de Baco,
canónigo de Ginebra,
le enseñaba el *Gamant ave*
[can this be *Comment avez?*]
por amor a la jaqueca.[3]

Quiñones de Benavente, too, tells of a drunken doctor who was a graduate of Geneva:

Doctor:

¡ Ah, señores, el tiempo está borracho!
Si no lo han por enojo, soy Juan Cacho,
que ya tanto el favor se disimula
que puede ser doctor cualquiera mula.
A este lugar insigne hoy he llegado,
que por Ginebra he sido graduado . . . .[4]

The phrase *caballo de Ginebra*, then, has the double meanings, "heretical horse" and "drunken horse," but the possibilities

[1] *Ibid.*, II, 808.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 380.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 345.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, 708.

contained in Cervantes' pun are far from exhausted. There is an evident allusion to card play. *Sota*, of course, means "knave," and the *caballo* or mounted horseman is the face-card next higher, corresponding in value to our queen. To the Soldier's "Come here," the Sacristan replies: "I am going there"; to the Soldier's *de Satanás*, he retorts with the name of a place presumably worse than Satan's abode; and with the *sota* in *sota-sacristán* (under-sacristan) he matches another face-card in the pack. To still further complicate matters, *sota* had the meaning "prostitute," and *caballo* likewise had its obscene connotation. Quevedo in his *Confesión de los mantos*, contrasts *sota* and *caballo* as follows:

A quien amago con sota,
doy coces con un caballo;
copas doy a los valientes,
y espadas a los borrachos.[1]

The allusions to card-play are here self-evident, and Durán sees also an obscene meaning in the passage. It is not necessary to suppose that Cervantes is guilty of obscenity in the passage under discussion, but such may possibly be the case.

If we ask ourselves which of the four *caballos* is meant by *caballo de Ginebra*, it would seem probable that it signified *caballo de copas*. From early times the suit called *copas*, "goblets," had been held to symbolize drunkenness. We find this already in Sánchez de Badajoz:

Los oros, bastos y espadas,
y copas, cuatro metales,
son las insignias notadas
que trae Lucifer pintadas
per banderas infernales.
Oros para codiciar,
espadas para reñir,
copas para embrïagar,
bastos para caminar
al hospital a pedir: [*Matraca de jugadores*[2]].

In Cervantes' century, card-players were accustomed to invent humorous designations for the various face-cards of the deck. For example, the different *sotas* were named after prominent local

[1] Durán, *Romancero General*, II (Madrid, 1912), 532*a*, and note.

[2] *Recopilación en metro del bachiller Diego Sánchez de Badajoz*, edited by V. Barrante y Moreno, Madrid, 1882, p. 33.

prostitutes.[1] These names would vary according to time and place. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the *caballo de copas*, the suit which was identified in Spaniards' minds with drunkenness, was sometimes called the "Genevan horse," or "gin horse." But if this was so, why should the name of a playing-card be applied to an individual as an insult? Nothing was commoner than this procedure. Just as the names of individuals were bestowed upon playing-cards, so the names of playing-cards were given to individuals as abusive epithets. I need only mention that in the *Entremés de los apodos*, that rich collection of terms of abuse, an old doctor is called "king of clubs," and a young man "knave of spades."

The above is offered merely as a hypothesis. It is difficult to recover the slang of another age and easy to see more in a phrase like this than it really contained. We must not forget that there existed also a game named *Ginebra*. I know nothing about this game and the function which the *caballo* played in it. It is doubtful whether there is any allusion to it in the passage in *La Guarda cuidadosa*. Monreal, Rodríguez Marín, and Hazañas de la Rúa, who have written so extensively on *la ciencia de Vilhán*, do not mention the game *Ginebra*, but the following passage would seem to indicate that, like Geneva the city, it was characterized by confusion:

> Pues que toda vuestra vida
> es como juego de naipes,
> donde todas son figuras,
> y el mejor, mejor lo hace;
> dejemos a cada uno
> viva en la ley que gustare,
> aunque su vida juzguemos
> a Ginebra semejante
> [*Entremés del hospital de los podridos*[2]].

Notice that the anonymous author of *El hospital de los podridos* couples the word *Ginebra* with an allusion to playing-cards, just as Cervantes does in *La Guarda cuidadosa*. Those who would attribute the first of these two farces to Cervantes are welcome to this mite of evidence.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Hazañas de la Rúa, *Los rufianes de Cervantes*, Seville, 1906, p. 43.
[2] Cotarelo, *op. cit.*, I, 98.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Rousseau and Romanticism. By Irving Babbitt. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1919. Pp. xxiii+419.

This volume deals less with Rousseau than with the whole *morale* of romanticism and less with romanticism proper than with modern literature at large. It is the most thoroughgoing and penetrating attack yet made in this country upon the tendencies of the last two centuries. This will appear if we survey briefly Professor Babbitt's philosophy, his ethics, his views of history, literature, and art.

I

In philosophy, the author stands for dualism as opposed to the monistic view, for humanism as opposed to naturalism, and prefers the "inward working" of the spirit to the doubtful gains of modern progress. He is an absolute classicist, whose god is Aristotle. He believes in measure, restraint, probability, and decorum, and the greatest of these is decorum. He follows Aristotle's definition of "two laws for man: an ordinary or natural self of impulse and desire and a human self," identified with the "power of control." (It will be observed that the first "self" is likely to be creative, the second critical.) The too free development of the natural self ("law for thing"), from Diderot to Ibsen and beyond, is made responsible for most of the world's woes. More than ever now are needed the restraints imposed by "the truths of humanism and religion": on the one hand, proportion and decorum, on the other, humility. A traditionalist, Professor Babbitt will base his creed on all ancient and "secular experience." From such a foundation he will rise to a "sound" rather than a "Promethean" individualism.

Now the two great traditions, Christian and humanistic, have "always" held to some form of dualism; but Rousseauism, because it affirms natural (primitive) goodness, is a "virtual denial of the struggle between good and evil in the breast of the individual." This is the naturalism which finds its antinomy in the humanism of Professor Babbitt; a humanism which rejects the "law for thing"; which suspects much of science, material progress, and the spirit of service; a humanism which is not humanitarian, which trusts more in humility than in humanity. The critic pays his compliments to Christianity, for any discipline is welcome, but the classical tradition is what he chiefly urges.

The humanist, then, desires to be "moderate and sensible and decent"—adjectives that do not occur to one while contemplating sunsets. His ideal is ethical self-culture, proceeding from a kind of "inner work and the habits

that result." This labor must be imitative, requiring a center and a model. It should be accomplished without vivid enthusiasm (*pas de zèle*, as the bishop said), though conversion and salvation are both attainable by the true humanist. He desires an ethical not a material efficiency, and the solution of working outwardly, as Goethe once proposed, is a "sham solution." But "to work according to the human law is simply to rein in one's impulses," the chief of which are elsewhere identified with the three churchly lusts for knowledge, sensation, and power. The *libido* that constraineth us must in turn be constrained.

This is a negative rather than a constructive program. It cautions us to lash down our feelings, passions, and imagination—which are conceded to be the driving forces of humanity—but it gives us very little idea of how to direct such forces to any creative end. In its utter safety, this may be a suitable philosophy for sheltered academes, but how can one attain to anything in literature or life by trusting to such maxims as these?—"The veto power" is the "weightiest fact with which man has to reckon." "A great civilization is . . . . a great convention." "Human breadth" is achieved "by taking on limitations."

This negativity granted, the present writer has no necessary quarrel with Professor Babbitt's attack on various features of the naturalistic creed. That is mainly a matter of personal belief and temperament, in spite of Professor Babbitt's distrust of temperament. And if one really believes that "modern philosophy is bankrupt from Descartes down" and that modern literature consists of an "incomparable series of false prophets," one has surely the right to say so. The latter-day combination of Baconian (scientific) utilitarianism and of Rousseauistic sentimentalism is viewed as all-pervasive and peculiarly dangerous. "The Greek humanizes nature; the Rousseauist naturalizes man." And naturalism implies endless change, a medley of values, a humanly purposeless science, the final triumph of machinery and force. There is truth in this, if mankind is essentially spiritual and ultimately one spirit.

At any rate, Professor Babbitt legitimately prefers Aristotelian universality and wholeness, the service of Platonic insight, the search for abiding central truth, the supremacy of the analytical reason in determining this; he urges the suppression of the separatist ego and the union of spirits upon some vaguely indicated "higher levels." What are these? Not the more inspiring human ideals, since a single-minded devotion to them is condemned in set terms. "Those who have sought to set up a cult of love or beauty or science or humanity or country are open to the same objections as the votaries of nature." None of them "can properly be put in the supreme central place," because none of them involves sufficient discipline. The detailed indictment of these five or six major ideals is surely too absolute. What *can* be put in the supreme central place? Man's best effort is bound within the circles indicated, together with a few more, but there is no

necessary hierarchy in this arrangement: they are intersecting not concentric circles. Yet it is not by slighting their importance that one can attain to the "rounded development" of the "complete positivist."

II

Although Professor Babbitt pays his tribute to the spiritual force of Christianity, the morality which he sets forth is rather that of the Old Testament than that of the gospels. "Thou shalt not" is more favored than "thou shalt." The *frein vital* is more praiseworthy than the Everlasting Yea. "All other evils in life may be reduced to the failure to check that something in man which is reaching out for more." The hunger of Oliver Twist would find no justification in this opponent of anything expansive. Buddhism is approved because it means "negatively the extinction of the expansive desires; positively, increase in peace, poise, centrality" (which have also a negative aspect). Both Buddhism and Christianity accept the burden of "moral responsibility," which the naturalist, in his "ethical passivity," seeks to evade.

It is true that the naturalist is not primarily seeking for burdens; he is after his kind of happiness, for Professor Babbitt concedes that "all men aim at happiness." But apparently all men should reach this goal along a set path, according to fixed standards, which imply an element of oneness. More acceptable is the insistence on ethical experience and guides, on ethical purpose and conscience in life and work. Yet even these principles are stated mainly as inhibitions and the romanticists are ruled out of the fold with the severity of a Minos. "There is no such thing as romantic morality." The philosophy of the beautiful soul is sneered at, for the *belle âme* is often full of delinquencies in practice. The romantic ideal was altruism, their "real" was egoism, and both "isms" are offensive to this critic. Straining beyond normal experience, the romanticist finds *his* happiness only in dreamland or nympholepsy and the resultant is a wide-spread melancholy, "the greatest literature of despair the world has ever seen." It might be answered that not all romanticists are desperate (Lamartine, Shelley, G. Sand), and not all desperate people are romanticists. But the real crime of these writers was their expansive individualism: "the general sense should never be sacrified lightly," and tabu is worthier than temperament. Also Rousseau turns virtue into a passion and conscience into a mere expansive virtue. This was originally the fault of the English Deists.

"The first place," Professor Babbitt sturdily declares, "always belongs to action and purpose" and ". . . . the problem of conduct remains." The problem is condensed in the supreme maxim, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Now, according to Maigron, Rousseauistic living produces bad fruits: therefore Professor Babbitt condemns romanticism. But the "orchard test" should in all fairness be applied to other products than to light life in the Quarter, suicide in a garret or Musset's affair with George

Sand. The fruits of romanticism are properly *literature*, not conduct. Romantic poetry is a fruit that the world has justly found seasonable and palatable. But Professor Babbitt objects to idling and to a "dalliant imagination," even when they reprehensively result in very fine poetry; "it is not easy to be more poetical than Keats," and yet Keats is classed as merely "recreative" and sensuous.

With these views it is not surprising that Professor Babbitt rejects Art for Art's sake. "Beauty loses most of its meaning when divorced from ethics." Art must have the quality of high-seriousness, though without direct didacticism. True drama, for instance, "requires a scale of ethical values." The romanticists have confused *all* values, especially the ethical. In love, they have confused flesh and spirit (which is "human" enough). In nature-worship, they have confused morality and pantheism in a "sham spirituality." Lowell, Browning, and Wordsworth have left us with the idea "that to go out and mix oneself up with the landscape is the same as doing one's duty"; whereas, to the classically minded, the landscape and nature-poetry are either recreative or all wrong. Again, "the romantic moralist tends to favor expansion on the ground that it is vital, creative, infinite" (amen!); and finally, "the underlying assumption of romantic morality is that the virtues that imply self-control count as nought compared with brotherhood and self-sacrifice." These two admissions, duly weighed, probably say as much for romantic morality as one would wish to say.

III

Except in the matter of definition and as regards the origins of the movement, Professor Babbitt does not aim primarily at a historical treatment of romanticism. His point of view is rather philosophical and he is mainly occupied with analyzing and illustrating that type of romanticism which he styles "emotional naturalism." It would not then be fair to expect a complete history of the movement, with differentiation of its various phases and shades. Yet some historical errors seem implicit (1) in a view of modern history which almost wholly condemns the writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; (2) in a one-sided estimate of many great men; (3) in overemphasizing the spread of Rousseauistic romanticism, without due regard to the varieties represented by other writers. Let us consider first Professor Babbitt's view of history.

We learn that as early as the Church Fathers, "human nature had gone bankrupt; and for some time it needed to be administered in receivership." The Renaissance, acceptable in so far as it fostered a true classicism, is less laudable in its "revival of the pagan and naturalistic side of antiquity" and also in its "strong tendency towards individualism." The French classical age, fortunately, moved toward a general or common sense (in *either* sense) and distrusted individualism and imagination. It is due to Professor Babbitt to say that elsewhere he appreciates the quality of the

classical imagination as found in Racine. But in this volume he rather impairs his argument by failing to stress the virtues of the various French classicists—he prefers the Greek. . . . . In the meantime, what was happening across the channel? There is no scamping of the merits of the age of Shakespeare. Professor Babbitt not only admires "Elizabethan inspiration," but speaks warmly and somewhat inconsistently of that "great creative literature, in which the freedom and spontaneity of the imagination had not been cramped by a too strict imitation of models." But, from now on, *nil admirari* is his motto.

The chief objection to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment is that it "did not have enough light." The main currents of that century are correctly stated as pseudo-classic formalism, excessive Cartesian rationalism, and the new empiricism, proceeding from Bacon and Locke. This empiricism is "naturalistic," and so is emotional deism, with its effusiveness. These several tendencies are viewed askance and Professor Babbitt, justly enough, sees neo-classic formalism as the real spring-board for romanticism. It could hardly be expected that he would appreciate the humanitarian and liberalizing features of *la philosophie* or of the Revolution.

The nineteenth century is full of sophistries. It is likely to prove "the most wonderful and the least wise" of centuries. It contains a "prodigious peripheral richness and a great central void," in which echo hollowly the voices of sham prophets. It encouraged various false "attempts at communion" (see "five major ideals" above), which appeal only to the half-educated. Also—*horresco referens*—it nurtured the monster Romanticism (see section IV, below), a pot-pourri of false ideals, "a movement that from Rousseau to Bergson has sought to discredit the analytical intellect." As for the rest of the century, Professor Babbitt readily accepts the theory that makes realism the reactionary continuation of romanticism—"romanticism on all fours." Is that definition applicable to Leconte de Lisle, Dumas *fils*, and Thomas Hardy? Professor Babbitt considers both forms (extreme unreal and extreme real) as different aspects of naturalism, a common impulse to get away from decorum. Applicable to Zola, this view tells us very little about Balzac. As for the contemporary scientific movement, that apparently manifests itself mainly in the "dehumanizing of man." Carry on a little farther and we get still another "bankruptcy" in Pragmatism, other vicious offspring of *l'art pour l'art* in the "maniacs of expression of the twentieth century." However, one can only assent to the view that the Germans have been the chief masters of soulless science and that our "anarchical age" finds its crowning stupidity in the Great War. It seems less clear that civilization is menaced by the "present alliance between emotional naturalists and utilitarians" and it seems quite exaggerated to declare that if Rousseau's philosophy is unsound, therefore "it follows that the total tendency of the Occident at present is away from civilization." *C'est la faute à Rousseau*, as Gavroche said.

When it comes to individuals, Professor Babbitt warns us that from partial passages, "the reader will perhaps be led to infer a total condemnation of the authors so quoted"; the effect indeed is usually that of a total condemnation, because of the vehemence of the critic's prejudices. His judgments, from the ethical standpoint, are frequently wise and salutary. But he seems to have no other standpoint. Appreciation of poetry, as such, is at a discount, and those writers whose legacy is not primarily a moral message are often viewed through a glass darkly. A number of examples will make this plain. Among the great names, Aristotle, Buddha, and Confucius are valued for their practical ethics, Shakespeare and Cervantes mainly for their "centrality," Homer for his imitative objectivity. There are also tributes to the Socratic method, to Sophocles, Milton, and Dante. Goethe is praised for his final serenity, Pascal for his *esprit de finesse* and Dr. Johnson for his "ethical realism." This practically exhausts the list of Professor Babbitt's admirations. He criticizes specifically Molière as too worldly, Voltaire as too light, Pope as "inadequate," Diderot as naturalistic. The Cartesians are marked by a "dogmatic and arrogant rationalism" and the Kantians reveal a "central impotence." Whatever is romantic is wrong: Balzac (?), Schiller, Chateaubriand, Schlegel. As for Hugo, he lacks common sense and ethical insight and he is grossly melodramatic. Shelley's *Prometheus* is melodrama of another kind and this poet is a perfect example of the nympholept. Even Wordsworth and Browning are not spared. The former is granted some ethical elevation, but he is thoroughly wrong about nature and her teachings, as well as about childhood and the language of poetry. Browning is meant for the half-educated, and the critic rather disagreeably sneers at the *Summum Bonum*, the idea that supreme happiness may be found "in the kiss of one girl"; Browning represents a "hybrid art" and other verses of his are called the "most flaccid spiritually in the English language." Among contemporary thinkers, Bergson's "monstrous sophistries" are scored, W. James is "wildly romantic," and these two, together with Professor Dewey, are suffering from naturalistic intoxication. One might go on and list the "delusions" and disillusions of Vigny, Flaubert, and G. Sand, but the censorious bias is already evident.

Rousseau, perhaps more warrantably, bears the brunt of these attacks because Rousseau does set up principally as an ethical teacher. The main doubt that suggests itself here is historical. It may be admissible to hold that "Rousseau represents more fully than any other one person a great international movement." Even so, it is questionable whether the romanticism of Hugo and Shelley, of Schiller and Wordsworth, is primarily a Rousseauistic and emotional romanticism. The individualism which is at the core of the movement tended to wide differentiations in romantic writers of various countries. Jean-Jacques himself is reprehended, philosophically and morally, because of his lack of deep reflection, his primitivism and nature-worship, his failure to divide sense and spirit, emotion and

virtue. Ethically, it is quite possible to differ from Rousseau. But again Professor Babbitt fails to point out the literary values of his sensibility, his imagination, his "impassioned recollection" and his impassioned prose. Rousseau is viewed as the "arch-sentimentalist," spiritually a sham, imprisoned by his ego, insisting on his uniqueness, standing for wonder, spontaneity and savage ignorance, unadjusted, self-indulgent and dalliant, a father of false gospels. The genuine power and feeling of his writings is not noticed. What is emphasized is the "audacity of revolt in the name of feeling from both humility and decorum." Are these recurrent virtues necessarily superior to feeling? The rigid humanistic attitude is again indicated in this extract: "It is easier to be a genius on Rousseauistic lines than to be a man on the terms imposed by the classicist." It is surely safer—but is it easier?

IV

We are now ready to examine Professor Babbitt's conception of aesthetics, as well as his understanding of romantic versus classical art and literature in the abstract. I do not find that he has any theory of aesthetics *per se*. It is styled a "nightmare subject." The term implies an effort "to rest beauty upon feeling," which is an ever-shifting basis. Beauty itself "loses most of its meaning when divorced from ethics," and the pursuit of mere beauty is the "pursuit of illusion." Yet the author grants the necessity of illusion whether in life or art. The best classicist "perceives his reality only through a veil of illusion," the right use of which is not to project the imagination toward an endless torrent of change, but rather toward the abiding "element of oneness" which remains central in the flux. The worship of art, however, as professed by Flaubert, is a sham religion and George Sand's manifesto contains much more truth. *Rien n'est beau que le vrai*—yet Keats's attempt to link the two, Professor Babbitt wittily observes, was disproved as long ago as the Trojan War. So in the case of Helen, the Greeks seem to have fought for beauty on its own merits. Still we learn that "ethical beauty in the Greeks resides [mainly] in order and proportion; [it is] not a thing apart." A chief modern source of aesthetic confusion was Shaftesbury, with his "inclination to identify the good and the beautiful." Rousseau develops this aesthetic morality.

The effort here is inconsistent: Professor Babbitt's argument tends partly to submerge the beautiful (without estranging it) beneath the ethical and the true; partly to displace and disjoin beauty from truth and goodness, thereby allowing a possibly separate existence. The latter tendency is seen also in the admission that rich poetical effects may be gained from reverie and association with nature, activities which are rather amoral. This does not mean that one should acclaim or rejoice in poetry. For Professor Babbitt, "the light that never was on sea or land," is Arcadian spoofing, and "the desire of the moth for the star" is dismissed as mere nympholepsy.

The partial definition of romanticism from which the critic works is as follows: "a thing is romantic when it is wonderful rather than probable . . . . , when it is strange, unexpected, intense, superlative, extreme, unique." The definition has reference rather to the dawn of romanticism than to its more conscious literary expression. We learn that "the uncultivated human imagination is romantic" and "incurably melodramatic." We learn further that "all children, nearly all women and the vast majority of men always have been, are and probably always will be romantic." Is not this an admission that the romantic is an inherent part of human nature? Professor Babbitt speaks also of man's "primary demand for some haven of refuge," his "ineradicable longing" for some Arcadian escape, his craving for endless vistas and for a "view of life to which the perception lends immediacy and the imagination infinitude." What the writer does not indicate is that this longing may have a spiritual source and become a spiritual adventure. The idealism of Lamartine, the honor of "Lord Jim," Musset's cry, "Malgré moi l'infini me tourmente," the spirit of Stevenson and of Cyrano, Kipling's "True Romance," these and such as these are not mentioned. But Rousseauistic romanticism is again scored for its freakishness, its preoccupation with its own uniqueness, the fact that it "tramples verbal decorum under foot," its eccentricity and unreality, its feminine feeling for magic and glamor. "Nothing is in itself romantic; it is only imagining that makes it so" (cf. Shakespeare). And thus we pursue the wrong kind of illusion. In Chateaubriand's romanticism, for instance, the conspicuous elements are these: "Arcadian longing, the pursuit of the dream-woman, the aspiration towards the infinite . . . . with the cult of nature." For in the despotism of mood to which the romanticist submits, he will "tend to make of nature the plaything of his mood." Not only is nature a refuge but an ideal setting for *la solitude à deux*. Romantic love is fatally linked with emotional intoxication (and "thrills" are always objects of suspicion), with "infinite indeterminate desire," and particularly with the *moi* of the poet. "The more Titan and Titaness try to meet, the more each is driven back into the solitude of his own ego." So Musset is the "chief martyr of this mortal chimera," the delusion that passionate romantic love can truly exalt and ennoble. Even Perdican's immortal plea is turned against him! Finally, the "sense of uniqueness in feeling passes over into that of uniqueness in suffering"—and romantic melancholy is enthroned. A chief objection to the whole movement, of course, is its "evasion of moral responsibility and setting up of scapegoats" (e.g., fatality).

This indictment, together with the numerous passages cited in other connections, leaves little doubt as to Professor Babbitt's prejudice. It must be added that he makes a few concessions, allowing the romanticists certain poetic gifts and their share of soul and imagination. We pass to the author's own ideal, which is classicism. He had already spoken of the romantic *débâcle* as due in part to the difficulty of uniting "men who are

indulging each to the utmost his own 'genius' or idiosyncrasy." Desiring brotherhood or sympathy, they attain only solitude. But "great literature" is rather defined as the "interpretation of an infinite that is accessible to those who possess in some degree the same type of imagination." On this basis of the greatest common denominator Professor Babbitt would construct the positive side of his humanistic program, all compact of what is normal and central, disciplined and decorous. The "mediatory virtues" may be summed up in the Greek conception of decorum, which means simply the preservation of smoothness and temperance amid the storms of passion. Ethical art has such restraint and calm; and its "only rule . . . . is to view life with some degree of imaginative wholeness." Experience and imagination together will give us a Greek universality, a "knowledge of the abiding human element." And taste mediates between what is unique creatively and what is representative humanly. Such are the classical qualities; now here is the "heart of the classical message: one should aim first of all not to be original but to be human, and to be human one needs to look up to a sound model and to imitate it." (To whom did the *first sound model* look up? If eighteenth-century neo-classical "looking up" had continued indefinitely, could posterity ever cease looking down?) Anyhow, "the [resulting] imposition of form and proportion is . . . . culture." And genuine culture is difficult, disciplinary, opposed to Rousseauistic spontaneity.

This is the central debate between the schools: the romanticist declares you cannot "submit to the yoke of either reason or imitation and at the same time be imaginative"; the classicist grants the supremacy of the creative imagination, "but adds that to imitate rightly is to make the highest use of the imagination." Is it still a question of imitating books or of true Aristotelian mimesis? Another hazy point is the definitionof "insight." We are perpetually hearing that classicism rests on an "immediate insight into the universal," that the classicist apprehends intuitively "the total symmetry of life." Without venturing to deny this wonderful power, we should like to learn more about its nature and processes. If it functions absolutely and beyond our ken, it would seem to have some kinship with the romantic conception of genius.

V

Professor Babbitt's chapter on romantic genius, naturally, is inadequate, and one is not content with the chapter on romantic love. The most forceful chapters are those concerning romantic morality and "The Present Outlook." "Romantic Irony" would be thin, were it not thickened out by the insertion of various other matters. Occasionally the treatment, without losing its semblance of logic and its "powerful dialectic," tends to become scrappy and "peripheral." So there are many returns to the *motif* and many repetitions. But on the whole the method and the style are of a high order,

needing no commendation from the reviewer and no recommendation to all who know Professor Babbitt's former volume on the *Masters of Modern French Criticism*. It is only the content of *Rousseau and Romanticism* which seems in some respects "perilous stuff," largely because the author will close his ears to the sirens' song, whether they sing of poetry and creation, or of landscapes and love. Stevenson once said that there were two principal kinds of truth, a truth for the old and a truth for the young; perhaps classicism is the better truth for critics and romanticism for those creatively inclined. Nature, *magna rerum parens*, includes every ism, together with critics and poets.

Finally it should be said that Professor Babbitt, in the course of his long argument, has uttered many wise and fair judgments. One is bound to accept much that he says about the dangers of Rousseauistic living. If the questionable judgments appear more salient in this review, that is because the author's constant habit of attack seemed to call for a serried system of defense. Curiously enough, his own statements, by reason of their thoroughgoing quality, have often supplied or implied the counter-irritant. A few more examples of this, partaking of the *de te fabula* variety, may be offered by way of valediction. "One can discern . . . . the danger of a classicism that is too aloof from the here and now. . . . ." "He was not capable of a poetic faith, not willing to suspend his disbelief on passing from the world of ordinary fact to the world of artistic creation." "Tradition and routine will be met sooner or later by the cry of Faust: *Hinaus ins Freie.*"

E. PRESTON DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Französische Dichter des Mittelalters: II. Marie de France. By EMIL WINKLER. *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Academie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse.* 188. Band, 3. Abhandlung. Wien, 1918. Pp. 127.

In this elaborate treatise, Emil Winkler has attempted to identify Marie de France with the Countess Marie de Champagne (1145–98). The thesis attracts by its dramatic interest: these two women stand out in high relief among twelfth-century personalities. The first ranks among the most talented of the Old French poets; the second was a leader in society and a patroness who surrounded herself with a remarkable group of writers.

In support of Winkler's contention it may be said that both Maries were of noble birth; both were interested in love-literature, one as an author (the *Lais*), the other as a patroness; both turned their attention, toward the end of their lives, to pious works (the *Espurgatoire Saint Patriz;* Evrart's translation of *Genesis;* the *Eructavit*); and both lived in the second half of the twelfth century. Winkler makes use of these generally accepted facts, but he has discovered no additional evidence.

He has attempted to show that the love treatment in Marie's *Lais* is in conformity with the views ascribed to Marie de Champagne by Andreas Capellanus in his *De amore*. But Marie de Champagne seems to have enjoyed detailed discussions of love questions, whereas the love treatment in the *Lais* is naïve: it shows no trace of a *précieux* environment such as the Countess of Champagne created.

Winkler seems to realize the weakness of his positive argument and therefore his chief effort is to combat the opposing views generally held by scholars in regard to Marie de France: that she was born in the Vexin, in the extreme west of the Isle de France, and that she lived and wrote in England, whereas it is certain that Marie de Champagne was born in Paris and lived in Champagne from the age of eighteen until her death.

Marie's statement *si sui de France* (*Fables, Epilogue,* l. 4) is taken to imply that she was living outside of France; there are certain Anglo-Norman traits in her language; she gives some description of Pistre, a small town in the Norman Vexin (*Dous amanz,* vss. 18 ff.), accurate enough to imply familiarity with the place; two pieces of internal evidence were advanced by Mall to indicate that Marie was living in England when she wrote the *Espurgatoire Saint Patriz;* Bédier interpreted the expression *terres de là* (*Milun,* 330) as implying that Marie was living in England when she wrote this *Lai;* several English words are used in the *Lais* and the *Fables;* Marie states that she translated the *Fables* from an English original (Marie de Champagne could hardly be expected to know English); finally, the best manuscripts of all the works of Marie de France that we have were copied in England: these are the well-known arguments advanced by scholars in the past.

Winkler attacks these arguments in order, except that he neglects the evidence afforded by the description of Pistre. But he is able to refute satisfactorily only those of Mall. He declares that Marie de France was born and lived in the heart of France because of her own statement, *si sui de France;* he believes that the poet is using her title as the daughter of the king of France. But it may be objected that a title would not be divided in this way: *Marie ai nom, si sui de France;* it is also improbable that a person writing in France would make this unnecessary statement.

Winkler states that Warnke's investigation of Marie's language leaves no doubt that she wrote in the dialect of the Isle de France. At this point he appears to move a little too swiftly: let us look more closely at the evidence obtainable. This evidence is not all to be found in Winkler's pages. Warnke himself is much less sure of the conclusion to be deduced from his study of Marie's language (*Fables, Bibliotheca normannica,* VI, lxxx ff. summary on p. cxi). Warnke concludes that it is very hard to determine what dialect she used; but, in agreement with Suchier (*Altfrz. Gram.,* §19), he inclines to consider Francien her native speech on account of her use of the diphthong *ọu*<Latin ō. In addition he cites as evidence her use of the

rhyme *ueil*<*ŏcŭlu*:*soleil*<**solĭcŭlu** (*Espurgatoire*, 1822). Nyrop does not admit the diphthong *ọu*<*ō* (*Grammaire historique*, I³, §183) in Old French; moreover, T. A. Jenkins (*Espurgatoire Saint Patriz* [1894], pp. 22–28) has shown that Marie does not have *ọu*<*ō*. In his second edition (*Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 1903) in a note to line 1882, where *ueil* is in rhyme with *soleil*, Professor Jenkins refers to Suchier's argument based on this rhyme as unsound because the same rhyme is used by Angier (*Vie de Saint Grégoire*) who is known to have written in England. But, on the other hand, Warnke brings forward some strong indications of Anglo-Norman traits. Marie, moreover, separates the imperfect of the first conjugation from that of the second and third; *ei* has not developed to *oi*; *an*^{c} is kept separate from *en*^{c}.

Suchier and, following him, Warnke assigned Marie's birthplace to the Vexin, in the west of the Isle de France. Winkler cannot allow the matter to rest in this situation; he therefore affirms his belief that Marie wrote in the literary language of the time, referring to Suchier in Warnke's *Lais*², *Vorbemerkung*, to Groeber, *Grundriss*, I², 727, and especially to Gertrud Wacker's recent essay, *Ueber das Verhaeltnis von Dialekt und Schriftsprache im Altfranzoesischen*, 1916. If such is the case, her language would not help in determining her birthplace. This may be true; but her language may very well indicate where she lived during a large part of her life, and it may offer excellent evidence in this regard, especially if it is corroborated by other facts.

Next Winkler takes up Mall's evidence. He quite correctly discards the allusion to King Stephen because the name already stood in the Latin prose of Henry of Saltrey, which Marie translated. Line 1992 of the *Espurgatoire* states that certain monks

Vindrent a Lue en Engleterre.

This line translates the Latin "ad Ludense coenobium . . . . in Angliam redierunt." In the first edition *a Lue* was printed as one word: *alué*. Mall translated: "The monks came hither to England," and thought the author had thus shown that she was living in England. Winkler prefers to translate *alué* as "at once," unaware apparently that he is fighting a phantom, for the word is simply the name of the abbey of Louth Park, as was discovered long ago by Warnke (*Literaturblatt für germ. u. rom. Phil.* [1895], col. 87).

Winkler disagrees with Bédier (*Revue des deux Mondes*, CVII, 841, note) in regard to the interpretation of line 330 of *Milun:*

De tutes les terres de la

To Bédier the words *de la* mean *de là de la mer*, indicating that Marie was in England at the time. Winkler advances the idea that the author is considering the matter from the point of view of the hero's native land, and not from that of her own residence. The probability favors Bédier. Winkler would translate: "die dortigen Laendereien," a doubtful interpretation.

There are three English words in the *Lais: nihtegale* (*Laustic*, 6), *gotelef* (*Chievrefoil*, 115), and *garwalf* (*Bisclavret*, 4, 9). Of the first two Winkler makes light: *gotelef*, he says, is not to be found in dictionaries and, therefore, may not be an English word. *Nihtegale* would be a single word that a French writer might have known and might have been tempted to use on account of its strangeness. He attaches more importance to *garwalf*, which Marie carefully explains; for there is a French word *garou*. It seems to Winkler that the statement

Garwalf l'apelent li Norman

and Marie's explanation have no justification for their presence in the poem unless the word *garou* had penetrated to Normandy but not to France, and that Marie was writing for the people of inner France. If that were true how could Marie de Champagne know the word?

It seems very improbable that Marie de Champagne would have used any English words. Her public would be entirely ignorant of English and any use of English on her part would have been a pedantic and silly display of knowledge. We are not justified in supposing that she knew any English words at all. If the word *gotelef* did not exist in English, the ability to translate the two parts of the word *chievrefoil* and to fabricate such a word would imply a still greater knowledge of English. *Nightingale*, *goat*, and *leaf*, to which must be added *welke* and *sepande* (in the *Fables*), are so diverse in meaning that they indicate a rather extensive knowledge of English on the part of the author.

The question as to whether there was any intermediate English version of the *Fables* is very complicated, and Winkler cannot solve it, as he himself admits, after twenty-four pages of discussion.

Winkler does not attempt to prove Marie's statement,

M'entremis de cest livre faire
E de l'Engleis en Romanz traire

a falsification. He realizes, no doubt, that Marie de Champagne could not state with very good grace that she translated from English, for she probably knew no English and the people about her would be aware of that fact. His way out of the difficulty is again by means of translation and he arrives at the following: "Ich habe uebernommen, dieses Buch zu schreiben, und es, das im Englischen vorhanden ist, damit auch dem Franzoesischen zu vermitteln," but she is to take it from the Latin. This is, of course, impossible: the second *de* goes with *traire* and indicates the place from which the matter must have been taken.

The *Espurgatoire* has these lines:

Jo, Marie, ai mis en memoire
Le livre de l'Espurgatoire:
En Romanz qu'il seit entendables
A laie gent e cuvenables.

To Winkler, these lines indicate that Marie was writing on the continent; for, he argues, there were not enough French-speaking people among the laity in England at that time to warrant the translation. He is justified, no doubt, in maintaining that Denis Pyramus' reference to Marie's *Lais* (*Vie Saint Edmunt*, cf. *Modern Philology*, XII, 351) is not evidence that Marie lived in England.

The fact that the best manuscripts of all of Marie's works were copied in England does not imply, according to Winkler, that they were written there; for the largest number were copied in France and the oldest manuscript that we have is of the middle of the thirteenth century, which leaves sufficient time for the poems to have become popular in England and to have been extensively copied.

Believing that he has shown it unnecessary to assume that Marie lived in England, Winkler states that the suggestion of J. C. Fox (*English Historical Review* [1910], pp. 303 ff., and [1911], pp. 317 ff.) that Marie was an abbess of Shaftsbury and an illegitimate daughter of Geoffrey IV Plantagenet (died 1151), father of Henry II, loses its main support and therefore falls. Undoubtedly, Fox's identification will remain a more acceptable hypothesis than that of Winkler.

Winkler believes that the evidence shows only that Marie de France was connected in some way with the court of England and indicates, therefore, that she was of noble birth. For the sake of Count William she is willing to undertake the *travail e peine*

Ki que m'en tiegne pur vilaine (Prologue to *Fables*, 36).

That is, according to Winkler, she feels that it is beneath her station to write. This reminds him of Marie de Champagne who gave Crétien de Troyes the *sans et matiere* of *Lancelot* but left to him the *painne et antancion*, that is, the menial part of the work. But G. Paris has shown (*Romania*, VIII, 39) that Marie is troubled by coarse words that she has to translate. The context favors G. Paris against Winkler. Other prologues of the time, such as those of Crétien, that of the *Roman de Thèbes* and of the *Lais*, the beginning of *Guigemar*, and the *Epilogue* to the *Fables*, these show that Marie, like other poets of the time, considered it a duty and honor to write and to use the greatest care in her work. Marie attaches great importance to her "labor" and fears lest some cleric may claim it as his own.

Winkler adds an extensive but unconvincing and somewhat irrelevant discussion of the origin of the *Lais*. In this, he has devoted undue space to elements in the problem which are beyond his powers or which are of no positive value to him; as, for example, the long discussions of the immediate source of Marie's *Fables*, of English words, and of the origin of the *Lais*. Not only is Winkler's study hopelessly weak on the positive side, but he has failed to give due weight to contradictory evidence. He has neglected to put together all the allusions to the two Maries. If he had done so, he would have found that Crétien de Troyes (*Lancelot*), Gautier d'Arras

(*Eracle*), Conon de Béthune and Aubouin de Sézanne, Andreas Capellanus (*De amore*), Richard of England (in a poem written from his prison in Germany), and Evrart (translation of *Genesis*) designate Marie de Champaigne as Countess, and four call her Countess of Champagne; *Eructavit* contains a dedication to Marie, who is addressed as *ma dame de Champaigne*, while Aubouin de Sézanne calls her Countess of Brie. On the other hand, Marie de France is mentioned by Denis Pyramus in his *Life of Saint Edmond* as *dame Marie* simply (*Modern Philology*, XII, 351). Here we are told of the great success of her *Lais* in court circles; but in the seven references to Marie de Champagne there is no suggestion of any literary talent that she may have possessed, no reference to any work of hers except the single letter ascribed to her by Andreas Capellanus. If Marie de Champagne had written poems showing even mediocre talent, they would, undoubtedly, have been lauded by a dozen poets.

The chronology of the period is difficult to determine and there is still considerable divergence of opinion among scholars. This fact leaves Winkler's hypothesis rather hazy in spots. He is of the opinion that both Crétien de Troyes, in *Erec*, and Gautier d'Arras, in *Ille et Galeron*, were influenced by his "Marie." *Ille et Galeron* was written in 1167, when Marie de Champagne was only nineteen years old. Could she have been sufficiently mature at that age to have already written the *Lais?* The date of *Erec* is not fixed, but there is a tendency among scholars, recently, to date it earlier still. It may be found that the date of *Erec* is not very far from 1155, the date when Wace's *Brut* was completed, for *Erec* and the *Brut* have some similarities: in that year Marie de Champagne was ten years old.

The whole study seems to me a failure. It is an unfortunate attempt to force a conclusion, with insufficient evidence in its favor, by means of an arbitrary and unsound method.

FOSTER E. GUYER

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *August 1920* NUMBER 4

A NINTH-CENTURY ASTRONOMICAL TREATISE

In the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* for 1907 (Vol. XXVI, Section C, pp. 381–445) there was printed for the first time a Latin computistical treatise compiled by a ninth-century Irish continental teacher named Dicuil.[1] The sole surviving MS of Dicuil's treatise is now preserved in the Bibliothèque Municipale of Valenciennes, where it is classed N. 4. 43 (No. 386 in the *Catalogue* of Mangeart,[2] and 404 in that of Molinier).[3] Previously it had belonged to the monastery of Elno at Saint-Amand, to which it appears to have been given by Hucbaldus (840–930), who may also have been its scribe.[4] It was brought to Valenciennes during the period of the French Revolution. It is a parchment quarto of 118 leaves measuring 21.9 by 14.8 cms., written in long lines with 26 to the page. Titles are in capitals sometimes of violet color. Initials are in red or lilac. The volume is bound in wood covered with vellum. The writing is in excellent Caroline minuscules of the latter part of the ninth century—possibly the work of Hucbaldus,[5]

[1] For an account of Dicuil and his writings cf. Esposito, *Studies*, III (1914), pp. 651–76.

[2] *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Valenciennes*, Paris, 1860, pp. 375–77.

[3] *Catal. gén. des MSS des Bibl. Publ. de France, Départements*, T. XXV (1894), pp. 365–66.

[4] This we learn from the twelfth-century catalogue of the Saint-Amand library published by Delisle, *Le Cabinet des MSS de la Bibl. Nationale*, T. II (1874), p. 451, No. 93.

[5] For whom see Manitius, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, I (1911), p. 590.

as mentioned above. When at Saint-Amand, the MS was numbered N. 270. In the inventory printed by Sanderus[1] it is N. 247. The contents of the volume are:

Ff. 1a–26b: Isidori *Etymologiarum Liber ii.*[2]

Ff. 27a–56b: *Disputatio de Rethorica et de Virtutibus sapientissimi Regis Karoli et Albini Magistri.*[3]

F. 57a: *Sententiae Septem Sapientium.* See Mullach, *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*, I (1860), p. 235.

Ff. 57a–60a: A series of diagrams illustrating the divisions and subdivisions of philosophy, commencing at the bottom of f. 57a.

Ff. 60b–62a: *Origenis Prologus in Canticum Canticorum.* See Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, XIII, cols. 61 *sqq.*

Ff. 62b–65a: *Dicta Sybillae Magae. Non multi, non vel pauci . . . . nullus postea insanam me dicet, sed dei magam.* Then follow about 135 verses, *Mundus origo mea est, animam de sidere traxi. . . . . Vita brevis hominis finita solvitur annis.*[4]

F. 65b: Twenty-seven hexameters, *Iudicii signum tellus sudore madescet . . . . Precedet e celo ignisque et sulfuris amnis.* For this famous poem see Haupt, *Opuscula*, I (1875), p. 289; Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, p. 187; *Oracula Sibyllina bearb. von J. Geffcken*, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 154–55. This copy has not been collated.

Ff. 66a–118a: Dicuil's *Computus*, without either title or scribal *explicit.*

F. 118b: blank.

The scribe has evidently taken great pains in transcribing Dicuil's *Computus*, for he has made many corrections in his own work. As Manitius[5] remarks, he appears to have taken to heart Dicuil's line (p. 413, l. 6), *Rustica ne scribant has membra caveto loquelas.* Other corrections are due to later hands. Palaeographically the script presents all the characteristics of late ninth-century Caroline minuscule.[6] The combination *ae* is frequently so written, but we also find ę and simply e. In the matter of spelling we find the usual peculiarities and inconsistencies, e.g., *ymnus*, *rythmus* and *rithmus*, *ciclus*, *dyptongus*, *dactilus*, *pirgis*, *inicio*, *nunciabo*, *renunciabo*,

[1] *Bibliotheca Belgica Manuscripta*, Insulis, 1641, Pars I, pp. 54–55.

[2] This copy is not mentioned in Lindsay's recent edition (Oxford, 1911).

[3] For this work see Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 282–83, who does not mention this copy.

[4] There is a copy of this tract in the Bodleian MS Auct. T. 2. 23, ff., 88b–93a, of *saec.* X.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 650.

[6] The facsimile given in the Academy's edition (Plate XXII) represents f. 67a (not 67b as stated).

but *nuntiatas*, *nuntiatio*, etc., *endecas*, *scemata*, *disticon*, *scola*, *audatia*, *suptilis*, *linia* and *linea*, *zoziaco*, *distingitur*, *pasca* and *pascha*, *pascalis* and *paschalis*, *decennovennalis* and *decennovenalis*, *compotus*, *spaciosae*, *repperitur* and *reperitur*, *anastasseos*, *adfirmatur*, *reuma*, *adsissa*.

Dicuil's *Computus* was long attributed to Alcuin,[1] a mistake which arose from the note of contents in a twelfth-century hand on f. 1a of the MS, *Item rethorica Albini ad Karolum et computus eiusdem ad eundem*. The true authorship was first pointed out in 1855 by Bethmann.[2] A transcript of the tract was made by J. Heller[3] in 1875, from which Dümmler[4] printed some of the verses, including the two *Ymni per rythmum facti* (I, 9, and II, 7, ed. pp. 397, 405). The structure of these verses was investigated by Ebert,[5] and by Wilhelm Meyer.[6] The latter printed the third *Ymnus* (II, 14, ed. p. 414), and pointed out that Dicuil is an early example of a writer who uses hexameters with end-rhymes. Subsequent to the publication of the Academy's edition in 1907, a summary analysis of the work was given by Dr. Max Manitius.[7]

The *Computus* is divided into four books (*Libelli*), and is written partly in prose and partly in verse. As a scientific exposition its value is small. The arrangement is chaotic and the chapters follow one another in the most arbitrary manner imaginable. The treatment of the subject is anything but clear and the work is in fact a clumsy complication extracted from previous writers. Dicuil wrote, as we shall presently see, in France in the years 814–16, at a period when, thanks to the Carolingian revival of learning, astronomical (or rather computistical) studies were being cultivated with extraordinary interest at the Frankish court. To the early works of

[1] E.g., by Sanderus (*loc. cit.*), by the authors of the *Histoire litéraire de la France*, VI (1742), pp. ix–x, and by Mangeart (*loc. cit.*), who printed the five opening hexameters. Sanderus had given the index of chapters.

[2] *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XI (1855), p. 521.

[3] *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft*, etc., II (1877), p. 305.

[4] *Ibid.*, IV (1879), pp. 256–58, and *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poetae*, II (1884), p. 668.

[5] *Allgemeine Gesch. der Lit. des Mittelalters*, II (1880), pp. 392–93.

[6] *Sitzungsberichte der Philos.-Philol. Classe der Münchener Akademie*, I (1882), pp. 68 n., 91, 94, 97, and *Gesammelte Abhl. zur mittellateinischen Rythmik*, I (1905), pp. 193, 194, 195, 216, 220, 222.

[7] *Gesch. d. lat. Lit.*, etc., I (1911), pp. 649–51; see a note by Hellmann, *Neues Archiv*, XXXVI (1911), p. 623.

Victorius of Aquitaine (*Cursus Paschalis*, ed. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, I [1892], pp. 669 *sqq.*), of Dionysius Exiguus[1] (ap. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LXVII, cols. 19–28 and 483–520), of Isidore of Seville (*Etymologiarum* vi. 17), to the series of tracts edited by Bruno Krusch (*Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig, 1880), and to the later works of Beda (*De Ratione Computi; De Temporum Ratione; De Temporibus;* ap. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, XC), and the so-called "Munich Computus"[2] of 718, were now added the great astronomico-computistical compilation of the latter part of the eighth century[3] and the tracts derived from it, such as the *De Cursu et Saltu Lunae ac Bissexto* of Alcuin[4] (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, CI, 981–1002), the anonymous *Liber de Computo* drawn up in 810, published by Muratori,[5] and reprinted by Migne (*PL*, CXXIX, 1275–1372), and the extensive compilations of about 809 and 811–12, of which numerous MSS are in existence.[6] It was from these works that writers such as Dungal (811)[7] and Dicuil (814–16), employed at the Carolingian court, were able to derive their tracts. It is noteworthy that the discussion in verse at the commencement of Book II of Dicuil's work (ed. pp. 398–400), on the distances between heaven and earth and between the seven planets according to the estimate of Pythagoras and the ancient pagan sages is taken directly from the *Historia Naturalis* of Pliny (ii, 21, 83; 22, 84; 23, 85, ed. Sillig, 1851), a book from which Dicuil made very large extracts in his later tract *De Mensura Orbis Terrae*.[8] The vague references to

[1] Dicuil mentions this writer by name (ed. p. 424, l. 12), though he has probably taken the reference from later compilations.

[2] See on this still unprinted work MacCarthy, *Annals of Ulster*, IV (1901), pp. lxvii–lxxiv.

[3] A thorough investigation of this work is much to be desired; cf. K. Rück, *Auszüge aus der Naturgeschichte des Plinius in einem astronomisch-komputistischen Sammelwerke des achten Jahrhunderts*, München, 1888; Manitius, *Gesch.*, I, pp. 286, 373, 447.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 285–87.

[5] *Anecdota ex Ambros. Bibl. Codicibus*, III, Patavii, 1713, pp. 114–203; cf. Gabriel Meier, *Die sieben freien Künste im Mittelalter*, II (1887), pp. 6–7 (*Programm des Stiftes Einsiedeln, Studienjahr 1886–87*).

[6] E.g., four at Paris (cf. Delisle, *Cat. des MSS des fonds Libri et Barrois*, 1888, pp. 63–68, 72–76, 76–78, 81–84), one at Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, L. 95, of tenth century, and Monte Cassino 3 (cf. *Bibl. Casinensis*, I (1873), pp. 84 *sqq.*, and *ibid.*, *Florilegium*, pp. 57–96); Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 286, 373, 447. Further investigation of these MSS is much to be desired.

[7] Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 373–74.

[8] See on this point Esposito, *Studies*, III (1914), p. 665.

"Pagani" or "Philosophi" (ed. pp. 415, 441, 444) are taken from Isidore of Seville (*Etymol.* iii. 31–70; V, 30, 5–8, etc.).[1]

As a teacher of grammar Dicuil took a great interest in metrical subjects, and one of the special attractions by which he sought to please King Louis the Pious, to whom he dedicated his work, was the introduction of two chapters (i. 8, and ii. 13, pp. 392 and 408) entitled *De ludificis versibus*, in the first of which four hexameters are so constructed that the four verse-endings being retained they may be transformed into 72 hexameters which yield a quasi-meaning, and in the second the permutation is carried to produce 166 verses. Dicuil's model here is the poet Optatianus Porphyrius (c. 350 A.D.),[2] whose ingenious constructions were very popular and often imitated in the Caroline and pre-Caroline epochs.[3] This poet's Carmen 25[4] (*recens.* L. Müller, Lipsiae, 1877, pp. 26–28) is closely followed by Dicuil both for the construction of the four verses and for the method of permuting them.[5]

Reference has already been made to the three *Ymni per rythmum facti*. Other evidences of grammatical interest are the mention of Donatus (ed. p. 395, l. 36), and the lines at the end of the work (p. 445, ll. 11–27), the last of which is a quotation from Vergil (*Aeneid* i. 374). At p. 444, ll. 13–20, he points out the difficulty of being always clear in the treatment of technical subjects in verse, and states that he had for that reason dealt with some questions both metrically and in prose.

A few references to the Bible[6] may be noted.

The following information concerning Dicuil's personal history may be obtained from the *Computus:*

[1] There is as yet no comprehensive treatment of the history of astronomy in the early Middle Ages; cf. Sickel, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte, Ph.-Hist. Classe*, XXXVIII (1862), pp. 153–201; Meier, *Sieben freien Künste*, II (1887), pp. 3–15, 22–36; Cantor, *Vorlesungen über Gesch. der Mathematik*, I, 2ᵉ Aufl. (1894), pp. 495, 532, 780 sqq.; MacCarthy, *Annals of Ulster*, IV, pp. xiv–clxxxii.

[2] Cf. Teuffel, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, 6ᵉ Aufl., III (1913), pp. 216–17.

[3] Manitius, *Gesch.*, I, p. 754. Beda *De arte metrica*, cap. xxiv (*PL*, XC, 173), speaks of the *insigne volumen Porphyrii Poetae.*

[4] In the older editions (*PL*, XIX, 431) it is numbered 26.

[5] On p. 394, l. 5, remove stop after *solis;* p. 411, l. 5, correct *verbis* to *ciclos;* p. 411, l. 41, is clearly wrong; p. 412, l. 3, correct *verbis* to *ciclos;* p. 413, l. 4, correct *ciclos* to *verbis.*

[6] E.g., p. 389, l. 33, cf. III Reg. 17:11; p. 390, ll. 20–21, cf. Luc. 21:2–3; p. 432, l. 32, cf. Luc. 23:54–56; p. 432, l. 40, cf. Luc. 1:26.

Dicuil was the author (ed. pp. 390, l. 13, 395, l. 21); he was an Irishman (p. 388, l. 23); he was living in France, possibly in the capacity of a teacher of grammar at the court school (p. 444, l. 23), and compiled his treatise as a series of yearly gifts to Charlemagne's successor, Louis the Pious (pp. 382, l. 28, 389, l. 32, 390, l. 12, 395, l. 20, 396, l. 39, 404, l. 30, 408, l. 28, 413, l. 5, 414, l. 22, 439, l. 17); the first book was commenced in April 814 (p. 383, l. 7), and the fourth chapter was written on the 18th day of that month (p. 386, l. 20); Dicuil intended to present this book to Louis on the occasion of the Frankish festival on May 14 when the nobles would be making their annual presents[1] to the king (ed. p. 390, l. 17), but Louis does not appear to have been pleased with the Irishman's labors, for the latter complains (p. 395, l. 39) that though he was present while Dicuil was reciting his verses he would not listen nor offer any reward; the second book was composed in 815 (ed. pp. 402, l. 9, 414, l. 25), and Dicuil states that should anything in it appear obscure to the king he will explain it when they meet (p. 414, l. 21); the date of the third book is not given, but the fourth was completed in 816 (p. 444, l. 39), when, as he tells us (p. 440, l. 37), he was living far away from the sea. At p. 444, l. 12, he notes the unsatisfactory nature of his source (Isidore of Seville) and states that if anybody else would furnish a better account of the subject under discussion he would willingly adopt it.

Dicuil's *Computus* appears to have remained totally unknown down to modern times. Later ninth-century writers on the same subject, e.g., Hrabanus Maurus of Fulda whose *De Computo*[2] was written in 820, and Helpericus of Auxerre, whose work with the same title[3] dates from about 850, had no knowledge of Dicuil. Indeed the fact that we possess only one MS of his work shows that it was a complete failure and was but rarely copied.

The printed text of the *Computus* shows many signs of ignorance, misreading of the MS, and inexperience on the part of the editor.

[1] On this custom cf. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, IV, 2• Aufl. (1885), pp. 107–11, and *Hibernici Exulis Carmen* ii, v. 8 ap. Dümmler, *Poetae*, I (1881), p. 396.

[2] Ed. Baluze, *Miscellanea, cura* Mansi, II, Lucae, 1761, pp. 62–84; Migne, *PL*, CVII, 669–728.

[3] Migne, *PL*, CXXXVII, 17–48. Both Hrabanus and Helpericus are superior to Dicuil in clearness of exposition and orderly arrangement. Their tracts were widely read.

These deficiencies may perhaps be condoned when it is remembered that at the date of publication (August, 1907) the editor was nineteen years of age. In the following pages I give a collation of the printed text with the original MS, and also suggest some emendations which appear to me to be necessary:

P. 381, ll. 8–9, Dicuili . . . . Astronomia, *this title is not in the MS;* l. 17, decennovennalibus *MS;* p. 382, l. 12, decennovennali *MS;* l. 17, *for* saltu *the MS corrects* bissexto *in the margin;* ll. 26–27, Libellus . . . . I, *title not in MS;* l. 29, Per ludum *MS;* l. 32, numquam *MS;* p. 383, l. 3, fiant *MS;* l. 4, primae quę *MS;* l. 8, quę *MS;* l. 20, quotcumque *MS;* p. 384, l. 20, sublati *MS;* l. 23, manifeste *MS;* p. 385, l. 7, uel cum *MS;* l. 13, *for* at *MS has* ac; l. 17, numquam *MS;* l. 36 *for* diurnum *MS has* diuinum; l. 37, *read* mensium, *and for last word* aut *MS has* uel; p. 386, l. 1, concluditur et quoniam *MS;* l. 4, *for* summa *MS has* sancta; l. 15, *for* iniamus *MS has* uiuamus; l. 23, superfuerant *MS;* l. 27, praenuntiatas *MS;* l. 35, *read* subtractos; l. 36, superfuerint *and* superesse *MS;* l. 37, superfuerit *MS;* l. 38, *for* tali *MS has* uel alio; l. 39, peruenire *MS;* p. 387, l. 19, supersunt *MS;* l. 24, superesse *MS;* l. 37, *remove commas after* Martii *and* Septembri; l. 39, *remove commas after* Martii *and* Novembri; p. 388, l. 28, falletue *MS;* l. 38, sepe *MS;*[1] p. 389, l. 3, *for* et *MS has* uel; l. 7, super *MS;* l. 24, multitudinem *MS;* l. 40, post consumptum primum *MS;* p. 390, l. 8, per dictos *MS;* l. 9, *remove stop after* videtur; l. 14, *remove stop after* annos; l. 15, peregi *MS;* l. 19, *for* iulea *MS has* uilia; p. 391, l. 13, *in col. 10 MS has* XXVI;[2] l. 19, *col. 4, MS has* XV *and in col. 11 it has* ii; l. 25, *col. 1, remove* Emb.; p. 392, l. 13, *col. 11 above* xxx *insert* Emb., *and in col. 12 MS has* xxviii; l. 22, *col. 12, MS reads* viiii; p. 393, l. 4, *remove stop after* bina; l. 29, *for* L *read* uel; p. 395, l. 10, *this line should read as in MS* Lucida per longos miscentes famina ciclos; l. 30, quocumque *MS;* p. 396, l. 1, *remove stop after* canto; l. 9, *for* spondet is *MS reads* spondeis; l. 13, prorsus *MS;* l. 19, *for* summus *read* summis; l. 24, *for* Tu *read* In; l. 28, *for* qui *MS has* quoniam; l. 39, *for* ne *of MS we should emend* nec; l. 40, Franci *MS;* l. 41, *read* Augusto; p. 397, l. 22, *read* Metaplasmos; l. 27,

[1] *In lines 15 and 19 read* uniuscuiusque.

[2] On p. 391, l. 2, *read* tyrannica.

for Nam *read with MS* Non; l. 28, *for* vera *read with MS* iura; p. 398, ll. 1–2, Libellus . . . . I, *no title in MS;* l. 10, Leuuarum *MS;* l. 17, leuuarum *MS;* l. 19, leuuae *MS;* l. 20, leuuas *MS;* l. 21, consumunt *MS;* l. 23, *we should perhaps emend to* per milia; l. 27, leuuis *MS;* l. 35, suptili *MS;* p. 399, l. 1, *read* praememoratis; l. 8, numerant *MS;* l. 11, *read* si milia,[1] l. 12, leuuas *MS;* l. 13, leuuae *MS;* l. 32, leuuae *MS;* l. 38, *at the end of this line in the right-hand margin of the MS* (f. 79b) *is a* "signe de renvoi" *indicating that two verses written in the lower margin of the MS are to be inserted:*

Cum solem adfirment alii lunamque habitare
In firmamento summo inter sidera fixa.

P. 400, l. 1, *this line is defective;* ll. 3, 4, *these lines to be inserted after* p. 399, l. 38, *as indicated;* l. 5, *not in MS;* l. 11, multiplica *MS;* l. 15, *after* illum *a word is effaced;* l. 24, dierumque *MS;* l. 26, *for* esse *MS reads* est; l. 27, constat *MS;* l. 29, *for* quem *MS reads* quoniam; l. 32, *for* regalis erit *MS reads* regulariter; l. 37, *for* dominus *MS reads* deus; p. 401, l. 27, quolibet *MS;* l. 32, *read* priori; p. 402, l. 3, spectaveris *MS;* l. 19, unoquoque *MS;* l. 36, finiatur *MS;* p. 403, l. 8, *for* Ibic *read* with *MS* Hic; l. 19, *after* subtrahere *add* memento; l. 37, tantundem *MS;* p. 404, l. 2, antecedente *MS;* l. 14, tamen *MS;* l. 17, embolismi *MS;* l. 28, *after* secundo *insert* in alio;[2] p. 405, l. 1, *for* cicli *read with MS* diei; l. 8, *for* fallerit *read with MS* fefellerit; l. 14, *for* videris *read* volueris; l. 20, *for* sic *read with MS* sicut; l. 32, rithmus *MS;* p. 406, l. 13, *for* primumque tenet *we should perhaps emend* primum retinet; l. 27, mundus *MS;* p. 407, l. 5, saltus *MS;* l. 10, orti *MS;* l. 16, nouies *MS;* p. 408, l. 5, *perhaps we should read* semper per pasca; l. 11, Illos cum *MS;* l. 18, octos *is clearly wrong;* l. 19, *for* est et *the MS has esset;* l. 21, quis *MS;* l. 28, *insert comma after* rector, *and remove comma after* multorum; l. 29, *for* Si *MS reads* Sis; l. 38, *for* binae *read* bina; p. 409, ll. 3–5, *these three verses are written in the lower margin of the MS with a* "signe de renvoi" *for their insertion after* p. 409, l. 2; p. 410, l. 5, tardantis *MS;* p. 410, l. 8, tardantis *MS;* p. 413, l. 6, *read* Rustica ne; l. 24, *for* parabis *read with MS* porro bis;[3] l. 28,

[1] On p. 399, l. 10, *read* semita.

[2] *In this line* numque *seems wrong.*

[3] *On* p. 413, l. 26, *for* Si per *emend* Semper, *and on* p. 416, l. 17, *read* continenter.

after this verse insert the line Postremos scripti qui non sunt sed numerati; l. 30, *remove stop after* valerent; p. 414, l. 2, *for* et *MS reads* uel; l. 12, nimpe *MS;* l. 23, Sis *MS;* l. 26, promisum *MS;* l. 35, pirgis *MS;* l. 38, *after* volo *place a full stop;* p. 415, ll. 1–2, *title not in MS;* l. 3, nimpe *MS;* l. 7, *read* errantum; l. 32, *heading not in MS;* l. 33, *for* haud *read* quem, *and note that ll. 33 and 34 are to be written as two hexameters;* p. 416, l. 9, *read* inaequalem; l. 19, *under* die *in the MS are three dots meaning that the word is to be omitted;* l. 19, *read* in sequenti; l. 32, *omit comma after* custodientes; p. 417, l. 1, *title not in MS;* l. 11, *for* diem duorum *the MS has* uel duos; l. 12, transilias *MS;* l. 17, unoquoque *MS;* l. 29, *for* Quin *MS reads* Quoniam; l. 37, *for* ast *read* ac; p. 418, l. 2, reperietur *MS;* l. 3, iii *is not in MS;* l. 5, primo *MS;* l. 8, *insert comma after* sumet; l. 11, scribendum *MS;* l. 23, *for* Plene his ex bis *read* Plene ex his; p. 419, l. 5, *col. 9, for* ast *read* et; l. 13, *col. 2, MS reads* Id. *and so down the column;* l. 20, *col. 10, insert* i; l. 24, *col. 10, insert* i; l. 28, *col. 10, insert* i; p. 420, l. 2, *read* unoquoque; l. 20, tantundem *MS;* l. 22, bissextum *MS;* l. 26, occurrere *MS;* l. 37, iii *MS;* l. 38, *for* numeri *MS reads* nostri; l. 39, *for* certa *read* certe; l. 39, *for* Quin *read* Quoniam; l. 41, cicli *MS;* l. 41, *comma after* decennovenali; p. 421, l. 1, *comma after* undecimo; l. 2, *comma after* duodecimo; l. 11, viii *MS;* l. 20, exordio *MS;* l. 34, *for* et *MS has* uel, *and for* Quin *it has* Quoniam; l. 36, *for* diem *MS has* diei; p. 422, l. 18, *for* et *MS has* uel;[1] l. 22, posse-derit *MS;* l. 33, Quoniam *MS;* p. 423, l. 11, inuicem *MS;* l. 15, *for* quae *MS has* duae; l. 16, *for* quae *MS has* duae; l. 17, *for* at *read* ac; l. 22, *after* endecadis *the MS inserts* anni; p. 424, l. 9, *for* aut *MS reads* uel; l. 12, *for* doni suis exiguis *the MS reads* Dio-nisius Exiguus; l. 15, *for* ast *read* ac; l. 19, eaedem *MS;* l. 21, nimpe *MS;* l. 22, manserint *MS;* l. 23, *for* ast *read* ac; l. 27, *for* ast *read* ac; p. 425, l. 12, *read* consummatis; l. 22, *after* die *MS inserts* sancto; p. 426, l. 2, transilias *MS;* l. 4, *read* consummatis; l. 5, inter *MS;* l. 18, *for* ast *read* at; l. 25, *read* transilias; l. 41, pas-cales *MS;* p. 427, l. 12, *remove stop after* manifestat; l. 24, *in the column of figures under* iii *insert* i; l. 28, *remove comma after* ratione; p. 428, l. 7, decennovennali *MS;* l. 33, *read* additis; p. 429, l. 32, viiii *MS;* l. 33, *read* uniuscuiusque; p. 431, l. 31, *heading not in*

[1] On p. 422, l. 11, *read* anastasseos.

MS; l. 34, *read* hoc est; p. 432, l. 5, tantundem *MS;* l. 6, *after* incarnationis *MS adds* Domini;[1] l. 16, Moysaicum *MS;* l. 18, *read* imperium; l. 19, uigesimi *MS;* l. 21, terram *MS;* l. 30, *place a full stop after* incipiebant; l. 30, Propterea *MS;* l. 31, *after* sabbati *the MS inserts* que ante dominicam resurrectionem diei sabbati; l. 38, *for* dominus *MS reads* deus; p. 433, ll. 1–2, *heading not in MS;* l. 8, *for* de sidere *MS reads* desidero; l. 15, tacent *MS;* l. 17, *read* incipimus; l. 30, Sin *MS;* p. 434, l. 2, *read* lxxiiae *and remove* ac; l. 6, *remove stop after* bissexti; l. 6, illas *MS;* l. 11, incrementum *MS;* l. 14, *remove comma after* habeantur; l. 15, *read* unusquisque; l. 23, *read* unumquodque; l. 32, integro *MS;* p. 435, l. 9, *remove* et; l. 10, *for* quam *read* que;[2] l. 15, *read* DCCCCLX; l. 23, *read* sexagesima; l. 24, *for* die *read* dies; l. 25, DCCCC orum LX *MS;* l. 27, *for* et *read* uel; l. 32, *read* adsissa; l. 33, *not in MS;* l. 36, *for* quin *MS has* quoniam; p. 436, l. 11, *for* luminis *read* lunis; l. 12, illas *MS;* l. 13, *remove comma after* pluraliter *and insert* Et *before* ab; l. 15, *for* xxx *read* vi; p. 437, l. 1, *heading not in MS;* l. 7, *for* Quod *read* Quot; l. 12, *read* deesse; l. 15, *remove comma after* centum; l. 30, *heading not in MS;* l. 36, *for* quae *read* qui; l. 37, *read* expulimus; p. 438, l. 8, *read* CC tis; l. 10, *for* L *read* C; l. 12, Tantundem *MS;* l. 22, *for* lunaris *read with MS* lunas; l. 24, *read* plus quam; l. 25, *read* uniuscuiusque; l. 30, *for* et *MS has* uel; l. 31, *place comma after* fiant; p. 439, l. 1, *remove comma after* dies; l. 18, *after* sol *MS inserts* in; l. 27, *heading not in MS;* l. 35, *for* lunare *read* luna; p. 440, l. 2, *for* xvii *read with MS* xxii; l. 3, *remove comma after* diebus; l. 5, *remove comma after* diebus; l. 19, *under second* dixi *there are four dots in the MS indicating that it is to be omitted;* l. 21, xxviiii *MS;* l. 22, *under second* numeri *six dots for omission;* l. 28, *read* tardam; l. 30, rursum *MS;* p. 441, l. 1, *heading omitted in MS;* l. 10 *for* ast *read* et; l. 11, *for* et *read* ac; l. 12, lxxiii *MS;* l. 34, *for* at *read* ac; l. 36, *read* cessante; l. 37, *after* transmigrent *place a comma;* p. 442, l. 3, incessabile *MS;* l. 4, *heading not in MS;* l. 9, *omit* te; l. 23, *read* bisse *with MS;* l. 23, *place comma after* horae; l. 24, *comma after* transcurrat; l. 26, *comma after* peragrat; l. 30, *read* bisse; l. 34, zoziaco *MS;* l. 39,

[1] *On* p. 432, l. 9, *read* calculationis.

[2] *On* p. 435, l. 13, *read* uniuscuiusque.

xliiii *MS;* p. 443, l. 8, xiii *MS;* l. 16, *comma after* ostento; l. 16, *for* At *and* ast *read* ac; l. 23, zoziacum *MS;* l. 25, *read* xxvii; l. 26, *read* CXL; p. 444, l. 1, *under* dum *in MS are three dots for omission;* l. 26, Perfecte *MS;* l. 27, *this line requires emendation;* l. 39, *remove comma after* octo; p. 445, l. 7, *for* semper *read with MS both times* sepe; l. 12, *for* Non *perhaps* Nam; l. 21, for paria *read* pariter; l. 25, *this line should perhaps be thus emended:* Promissis multis iam sero pauca relatu.[1]

We may conclude with some remarks on the Latinity of the *Computus:*

For *Aprilis* Dicuil (or the scribe) writes everywhere *Aprelis,* a form which is not registered in any of the standard lexicons (*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,* Lipsiae, 1900–1915; Georges, *Ausf. Lat.-Deutsches Handwörterbuch,* 8e Aufl., 4 vols., Leipzig, 1912–19); the form *bisse* (p. 442) for *besse* is given in the *Thesaurus* (s.v. *bes*), and *leuua* (pp. 398, 399) for *leuga, leuca,* occurs in Beda and elsewhere (cf. Du Cange, ed. Henschel, s.v. *leuca*). Referring to the tides Dicuil (p. 435) uses the terms *reuma, adsissa,* and *recessa.* For *reuma* see Du Cange (s.v. *rheuma*) and Columbani *Ep.* v, ed. Gundlach, *Epistolae,* III (1892), p. 174; *Vita Condedi* ii, ed. Levison, *Script. Rer. Merov.,* V (1910), p. 651; *Vita Vulframni* viii, *ibid.,* p. 667; Beda *De Temporum Ratione* xxix, *PL,* XC, 423. For *adsissa* (*assisa*) see Isidore *De ordine creaturarum* ix. 5, 7, *PL,* LXXXIII, 936, 937; the word occurs as a gloss on *dodrans* in a Latin poem published by Thurneysen (*Revue Celtique,* XI (1890), p. 89). *Recessa* is employed by Isidore, *op. cit.,* ix. 7, *assisa sit recessa.*

The following words are not given by Georges: ludificus (pp. 381, 382, 397, 414); ordinaliter (383, 418, 426); oda (393, 396); praememorare (408, 417, 427); endecas (416, 423); iterate (417, 423); solanus (417, 427, 428, 431); decennovalis (420, 421); incarnatio (422, 432); inconfuse (423); titulate (431); ostentum (434, 435, 439); quadrantilis (435, 439).

The following are examples of late and technical words: alternatim, anastassis, anchora (canonica), binarius, bissextilis, bissextus, calculatio, ciclus, circumlustrare, codiculus, compotus, congregatim,

[1] *On* p. 390, l. 23, *for* crescesque *read* gregesque; p. 441, l. 21, chias *seems wrong.*

congrue, connumerare, continuatim, contrarietas, conversim, creatio, decennovennalis, diphthongus, elongare, embolismus, epacta, evangelicus, famen, fulgescere, horoscopus, immobiliter, immutabiliter, incessabilis, indictio, insensatus, metaplasmus, momentum, ogdoas, parasceue, pascha, paschalis, pirgus, punctus, quadragesima, quadrivium, recapitulatio, regulare, rotalis, rotella, rotula, saltus (lunaris), septempliciter, sparsim, specialiter, spiritalis, subsequenter, subulcus, tonus, transcensus, trigeni, unarius, veraciter, versificus.

MARIO ESPOSITO

DUBLIN, IRELAND

WALPOLE'S RELATIONS WITH VOLTAIRE[1]

A study of the Walpole-Voltaire correspondence is interesting from the historical point of view chiefly because it shows that in 1768—eight years, that is to say, before the notorious letter[2] which Voltaire wrote to d'Argental on the publication of Letourneur's translation of Shakespeare—the "apostle and martyr of the English" was already repenting of having introduced the "histrion barbare" to French readers in his *Lettres philosophiques*. It shows us too how the dilettante Walpole was willing to "fight to the death for the superiority of Shakespeare," and reminds us that it was partly toward this end that he produced his *Castle of Otranto*, a novel in which the sublime and the ridiculous were united in supposedly Shakespearean proportions, and the "deportment of the domestics" was based on the gravediggers' scene in *Hamlet*. Further, we can reconstruct by this means the story of the clash between these two kindred spirits, the man of the world dabbling in literature on the one hand, the man of letters posing as a leader of society on the other.

[1] Bibliography:

Correspondance complète de Mme du Deffand avec la Duchesse de Choiseul, l'abbé Barthélemy, et M. Craufurt (ed. le Marquis de Sainte-Aulaire, 3 tom., 1877; orig. ed., 2 tom., 1859; nouv ed. augm., 1866).

Correspondance complète de la Marquise Du Deffand avec ses amis le Président Hénault, Montesquieu, D'Alembert, Voltaire, Horace Walpole, précédée d'une histoire de sa vie, etc. (ed. M. de Lescure, 2 tom., 1865).

Lettres de la Marquise du Deffand à Horace Walpole, depuis comte d'Orford, écrites dans les années 1766 à 1780; auxquelles sont jointes des lettres de Madame du Deffand à Voltaire, écrites dans les années 1759 à 1775. Publiées d'après les originaux déposés à Strawberry-Hill (nouv. ed., augm. des extraits des lettres d'Horace Walpole, ed. N. T. Artaud, 4 tom., 1824 [this edition is a translation of Miss Berry's edition of 1810]).

Letters of the Marquise Du Deffand to the Hon. Horace Walpole, afterward Earl of Orford, from 1766 to 1780. To which are added Letters of Mme du Deffand to Voltaire from 1759 to 1775. Published from the originals at Strawberry Hill (ed. with a life of the authoress and notes, by Miss Mary Berry, 4 vols., 1810).

Lettres de la Marquise du Deffand à Horace Walpole (1766–1780) (ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee, 3 tom., 1912).

Correspondance littéraire, philosophique, et critique, par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal, Meister, etc. (ed. Tourneux, 1877).

Voltaire, *Œuvres* (ed. Beuchot, 1833 [the letters to Walpole are in Vol. LXV]).

Letters of Horace Walpole, Fourth Earl of Orford (ed. Paget Toynbee, 1891).

The Castle of Otranto, by Horace Walpole (2d ed., with Preface, 1767).

Churton Collins, *Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England* (1908).

[2] Voltaire to d'Argental, July 19, 1776; this letter is quoted below, p. 199, n. 5.

Voltaire was a "very" great man, Walpole a sufficiently small one; Voltaire was a cosmopolitan, his antagonist as full of insular prejudices as though he had never crossed the Channel; yet in this instance their motives and their methods of controversy are amusingly similar and equally questionable. In the end, circumstances rather than any merit of his own gave Walpole the *beau rôle* and allowed him to write later a summary account,[1] breathing virtuous disgust in every line; yet the quarrel would never have arisen had he not published some remarks on Voltaire as irrelevant as they were personal.

At this period Walpole was very popular in French society. The son of a prime minister whose policy had given France peace, he was also an Englishman in an age of Anglomania, and the owner of a complete Gothic castle in days when few French landscape gardens possessed anything more imposing than a Cave of Melancholy, or at most, like the Duc de Choiseul's park at Chanteloup, a Pagoda of Friendship. And Strawberry Hill contained too the "Officina Arbuteana," volumes from the presses of which were much sought after in Paris. We hear of gifts to Madame Necker, the Duchesse de Choiseul, the Abbé Barthélemy; of a complete set sent at the request of the librarian to the Royal Library itself. Grimm presents Walpole to the sovereigns of Northern Europe as the son of Sir Robert, the wittiest of Englishmen in Paris, the ill-advised printer of the Président Hénault's worthless *Cornélie*, a martyr to the gout, and—most important of all—the author of "la lettre du roi de Prusse à J-J Rousseau, qui a joué un si grand rôle dans la querelle de David Hume."[2]

It was this letter which won for Walpole an unusual vogue at the moment of its appearance, and caused him a great deal of annoyance

[1] "About the same time Voltaire published in the *Mercure* the letter he had written to me, but I made no answer, because he had treated me more dirtily than Mr. Hume had. Though Voltaire, with whom I had never had the least acquaintance or correspondence, had voluntarily written to me first and asked for my book [*Historic Doubts on Richard III*], he wrote a letter to the Duchess of Choiseul, in which, without saying a syllable of his having written to me first, he told her I had officiously sent him my *Works*, and declared war with him in defence *de ce bouffon Shakespeare*, whom in his reply to me he had pretended so much to admire. The Duchess sent me Voltaire's letter, which gave me such contempt for his disingenuity that I dropped all correspondence with him" (Walpole, *Short Notes of My Life*, April 24, 1769).

[2] Grimm, *op. cit.*, July 15, 1768. The Président sent Voltaire a copy of this Strawberry Hill edition of *Cornélie* (Mme du Deffand to Voltaire, July 3, 1768; to Walpole, November 9, 1767).

six months later. He wrote it at Paris in January, 1766, by way of ridiculing the affectations of Rousseau, who had just passed through the city with Hume, on his "flight" to England. The persecution to which he imagined he was subjected, and the martyrdom he seemed thirsting to endure, had provoked universal interest, though anything but universal sympathy. Walpole's not very witty *jeu d'esprit*[1] thus made him the fashion for the moment,[2] and when that fashion showed signs of dying a natural death it was revived by the quarrel between Rousseau and Hume, which, thanks to Grimm's *Correspondance*, Suard's *Exposé*, Hume's *Concise and Genuine Account*, Walpole's *Narrative*, and countless other pamphlets, prevented Voltaire, like the rest of Europe, from not knowing the name of Hume's "accomplice."[3]

It is thus not at all surprising that Voltaire should have wished to know more of the Englishman who had been teasing one of the blackest of his *bêtes noires*. He was too a genuinely devoted friend of Walpole's correspondent, Mme du Deffand; he owed to her relative Choiseul, another of Walpole's admirers, the prosperity of his manufactures at Ferney; he seems to have met Sir Robert during his stay in England (1726–29); his relations with the circle of Grimm and D'Alembert suggest that he knew most of what went

[1] *Le Roi de Prusse à Monsieur Rousseau.*

"MON CHER JEAN-JACQUES,

"Vous avez renoncé à Génève votre patrie; vous vous êtes fait chasser de la Suisse, pays tant vanté dans vos écrits; la France vous a décrêté. Venez donc chez moi; j'admire vos talens; je m'amuse de vos rêveries, qui (soit dit en passant) vous occupent trop, et trop long tems. Il faut à la fin être sage et heureux. Vous avez assez fait parler de vous par des singularités peu convenables à un véritable grand homme. Démontrez à vos ennemis que vous pouvez avoir quelquefois le sens commun: cela les fachera, sans vous faire tort. Mes états vous offrent une retraite paisible; je vous veux du bien, et je vous en ferai, si vous le trouvez bon. Mais si vous vous obstiniez à rejeter mon secours, attendez-vous que je ne le dirai à personne. Si vous persistez à vous creuser l'esprit pour trouver de nouveaux malheurs, choisissez-les tels que vous voudrez. Je suis roi, je puis vous en procurer au gré de vos souhaits: et ce qui sûrement ne vous arrivera pas vis à vis de vos ennemis, je cesserai de vous persécuter quand vous cesserez de mettre votre gloire à l'être.

"Votre bon ami,
"FRÉDÉRIC"

[2] See his letters to Conway, January 12, 1766; Chute, January 15, 1766; Gray, January 25, 1766.

[3] A full account of the dispute appears in Churton Collins, *op. cit.*, pp. 217–41. Walpole's letters to Hume (July 26, November 1 and 11, 1766) show him adopting, as he did in his *Narrative*, an attitude of well-bred contempt for all mere scribblers and *philosophes;* he cannot, however, conceal his annoyance at D'Alembert's having been offended that Rousseau should have attributed the letter of the King of Prussia to himself (D'Alembert).

into the *Correspondance littéraire*. The pretext on which he addressed Walpole we know; as to the motive we can hazard a plausible guess. He writes then to congratulate the author of the *Historic Doubts on Richard III* on having adopted an attitude of skepticism in treating of his subject—an attitude which he, Voltaire, has long been preaching as the only safe one for the historian to adopt.[1] Perhaps Walpole will be so kind as to send him a copy of the book itself, though the only claim he can urge is his desire to instruct himself further.

So far so good; but in 1767 there had appeared a French translation of *The Castle of Otranto*, a poor one according to Walpole,[2] though Grimm[3] praises the elegance and correctness of the translator, *l'infatigable M. Eidous—le fatal M. Eidous*, as he calls him in less flattering vein elsewhere. Grimm hardly knew what to make of the story itself; he found it difficult to admire, but succeeded in explaining the fact away with the one reflection which of all others was most calculated to rouse the wrath of the lord of Ferney—"il ne faut pas juger les ouvrages de M. Walpole comme ceux d'un écrivain de profession, mais comme des objets d'amusement et de délassement d'un homme de qualité." Even a philosopher, he continues, could not but shudder at the monstrous helmet, the giant sword, the walking picture, the hermit's skeleton, though "il est vrai que, quand on a lu cela, il n'en résulte pas grand'chose."[4]

It was from the Preface attached to the second edition that great things did result, as both Grimm and Mme du Deffand had from the beginning prophesied that they would.[5] Walpole replied to his old friend's remonstrances with a warm defense of his *Castle*—"de

[1] "Il y a cinquante ans, que j'ai fait vœu de douter. J'ose vous supplier, Monsieur, de m'aider à accomplir mon vœu! Je vous suis peut-être inconnu, quoique j'aie été honoré autrefois de l'amitié *of the too brother* [i.e., of Sir Robert and his brother *old* Horace]" (Voltaire to Walpole, June 6, 1768).

[2] *Short Notes of My Life* (March, 1767).

[3] Grimm, *op. cit.*, letter of February 15, 1767.

[4] The British Museum copy of the second edition has pasted inside the cover a cutting from the *St. James' Chronicle*, which gives the English view—a piece of verse to the author signed "Philotrantus." The second stanza runs:

"By thee decoy'd, with curious Fear
We tread thy *Castle's* dreary Round;
Though horrid all we see and hear,
Thy Horrors charm while they confound."

[5] "J'aurais voulu qu'on eût supprimé la préface ... il y est lu que Shakespeare a beaucoup plus d'esprit que Voltaire; ce trait vous met à l'abri de la critique de Fréron, mais ne peut manquer de vous en attirer bien d'autres" (Mme du Deffand to Walpole, March 8, 1767).

tous mes ouvrages ... l'unique où je me sois plu"—which will, he is convinced, find admirers enough when the reign of taste shall supersede that of philosophy. As for Voltaire, he seeks no quarrel with him, but he will maintain to the death the superiority of Shakespeare.[1]

A study of the Preface itself hardly bears out these pacific assurances. Walpole begins by explaining that his novel was "an attempt to blend the two kinds of Romance, the ancient and the modern. . . . . My rule was Nature. . . . . That great master of nature, *Shakespeare*, was the model I copied." It is from the speeches of the gravediggers in *Hamlet*, the rough jests of the citizens in *Julius Caesar* that he has learned how a contrast between the sublimity of the heroes and the naïveté of the servants will enhance the effect of the whole. But—and we feel at once how forced is the transition and how unnecessary the reference—Voltaire declares, in his edition of Corneille, that this mixture of buffoonery and solemnity is intolerable; well, "Voltaire is a genius—but not of Shakespeare's magnitude." To refute him, Walpole will appeal to his own opinions, expressed when he was speaking without prejudice. In the Preface to the *Enfant Prodigue* ("that exquisite piece of which I declare my admiration, and which, should I live twenty years longer, I trust I shall never attempt to ridicule"[2]), he says of comedy: "On y voit un mélange de sérieux et de plaisanterie"; and surely this must apply to tragedy equally well. Again, "in his epistle to Maffei, prefixed to *Mérope*, he delivers almost the same opinion, though I doubt not with a little irony."

This, though unnecessary, is not offensive; we may wonder what Voltaire is doing in this galley, but, renouncing the attempt to discover how he came there, we must agree that his captor has treated him with all due courtesy. Not so in the footnotes, however; Walpole's pages, like Gibbon's, carry their sting in their tail. "The following remark," he has the grace to admit, "is foreign to the present

[1] This reply to Mme du Deffand's letter of March 8 is quoted by Miss Berry in a note to her edition of the *Letters of Mme du Deffand*. Walpole, afraid of the publication of his letters to Mme du Deffand, had insisted on her returning or destroying them; she burned many in 1778; the rest she had sent to England by Conway in 1775. These last were apparently destroyed by Miss Berry in accordance with Walpole's will.

[2] This is a hit at Voltaire's change of opinion over Shakespeare. "The French critic has twice translated the same speech ["To be or not to be"] from *Hamlet*, some years ago in admiration, latterly in derision; and I am sorry to find that his judgment grows weaker, when it ought to be farther matured."

question"—but this does not prevent him from making it. May not "the severe criticisms of so masterly a writer as *Voltaire* on our immortal countryman" have been "the effusions of wit and precipitation, rather than the result of judgment and attention? May not the critic's skill in the force and powers of our language have been as incorrect and incompetent as his knowledge of our history? Of the latter his own pen has dropped glaring evidence."[1] Walpole too, we see, could on occasion be "a venomous insect."

Such was the Preface. It seems difficult to believe that Voltaire had not heard of it; Mme du Deffand's circle, which included many of his correspondents, was discussing it with dismay, Grimm had called special attention to it in reviewing Eidous' translation, and, even supposing that his dearest friends had preferred not to hurt his feelings by referring to it, his dearest enemies, and they were many, were no doubt enchanted to repair the omission. What more natural than that Voltaire, ever quick to resent a fancied insult, much more such a real one as the Preface contained, should have used his slight though perhaps genuine interest in *Richard III* as a pretext for joining battle with its author about this later work?

Whatever Voltaire's motive in writing the letter on *Richard III*, we may imagine the very mixed feelings with which Walpole received it. His reply[2] is certainly a masterpiece of tact, even down to the delicate flattery implied by his writing it in English, not to mention many compliments of a more direct and even fulsome nature.

> Without knowing it, you have been my master, and perhaps the sole merit in my writings is owing to my having studied yours; so far, Sir, am I from living in that state of barbarism and ignorance with which you tax me when you say *que vous m'êtes peut-être inconnu*. I was not a stranger to your reputation very many years ago, but remember to have then thought you honoured our house by dining with our mother—though I was at school, and had not the happiness of seeing you.

Then, after more general remarks, comes his confession; in the Preface to "a trifling romance, much unworthy of [his] regard," he has found fault with some of Voltaire's remarks on Shakespeare.

[1] The "evidence" could not well be more trivial. In his Preface to Thomas Corneille's *Essex*, Voltaire shows that he does not realize that the Earl of Leicester and Dudley were the same person.

[2] June 21, 1768.

This romance he now proposes to send, and very cleverly does he adopt the pose of the bluff and magnanimous Briton in doing so.

I might retract, I might beg your pardon; but having said nothing but what I thought, nothing illiberal or unbecoming a gentleman, it would be treating you with ingratitude and impertinence, to suppose that you would either be offended with my remarks, or pleased with my recantation. You are as much above wanting flattery, as I am above offering it to you.

By the same courier, Walpole wrote in much perplexity to Mme du Deffand. His letter is of course lost, but we can judge of its contents by the reply.[1] No, says his mentor, he was right in not speaking of his part in the Hume-Rousseau affair;[2] and yes, he was right in confessing to the Preface: "Je viens de me la faire relire, elle est terrible; il n'est pas vraisemblable qu'il l'ignore; mais s'il l'ignorait, il l'apprendrait un jour, et en ce cas il est bon de le prévenir: il y a de la noblesse et de la franchise dans ce procédé." But, adds this shrewd old tactician, having confessed that the Preface exists, why force Voltaire to read it? Why not quietly forget to send it? Above all, why run the risk of entering upon an interminable literary quarrel?[3] She wrote too to Mme de Choiseul at Chanteloup, asking advice and sending copies of the letters, seeking thus to enlist a powerful ally in the coming dispute.[4]

Voltaire's reply, an *Art poétique* in little, was written on July 15. He praises *Richard III*,[5] but devotes most of his attention to the questions raised in the Preface, though he nowhere mentions it by name and only in one or two instances replies to it point by point.

[1] Letter of June 28, 1768.

[2] Voltaire already knew of it from D'Alembert, who wrote on August 11, 1766.

[3] "Il me vient à l'esprit que, n'ayant rien à faire, il ne serait pas fâché de vous attirer à une correspondance littéraire, qui se tournerait en discussion, en dispute, et lui donnerait l'occasion de se venger de vous. Vous avez décidé que Shakespeare avait plus d'esprit que lui: croyez-vous qu'il le pardonne? C'est tout ce que je peux faire, moi, de vous le pardonner."

[4] "Je trouve la franchise de M. Walpole envers Voltaire extrêmement noble. ... mais pourquoi me dites-vous: *Ne vous détachez pas de notre ami?* Vous savez combien je suis disposée à aimer tous ceux qui vous aiment, et celui-là plus qu'aucun autre, parce que son personnel me plaît infiniment et que j'ai très-bonne opinion de son cœur et de son âme" (Mme de Choiseul to Mme du Deffand, July 6, 1768).

[5] "Vous seriez un excellent *attorney-general.* Vous pesez toutes les probabilités; mais il paraît que vous avez une inclination secrète pour ce bossu. ... Je veux croire avec vous que Richard III n'était ni si laid ni si méchant qu'on le dit; mais je n'aurais pas voulu avoir affaire à lui. Votre *rose blanche* et votre *rose rouge* avaient de terribles épines pour la nation."

Walpole, he not unreasonably complains, has tried to make the English believe that he despises Shakespeare:

> Je suis le premier qui aie fait connaître Shakespeare aux Français. ... J'ai été persécuté pendant trente ans par une nuée de fanatiques, pour avoir dit que Locke est l'Hercule de la métaphysique. ... Ma destinée a encore voulu que je fusse le premier qui aie expliqué à mes concitoyens les découvertes du grand Newton. ... J'ai été votre apôtre et votre martyr; en vérité il n'est pas juste que les Anglais se plaignent de moi.

For many years, he protests, he has been maintaining that Shakespeare's genius was his own, while his faults were those of his period—"c'est le chaos de la tragédie, dans lequel il y a cent traits de lumière." He admits that he has advocated, as Walpole declares, a mixture of the serious and the comic in comedy; even that he has said that "tous les genres sont bons, hors le genre ennuyeux." Granted: "mais la grossièreté n'est pas un genre," and this even the Spaniards are beginning to see. As to the unities, "vous n'observez, vous autres libres Bretons, ni unité de lieu, ni unité de temps, ni unité d'action"—and the plays which result are none the better for it.

Walpole had attacked in his Preface the occasional flatness of the style of Racine; Voltaire broadens the question by the sweeping nature of his reply. Paris, he declares, is far superior to Athens for comedy and tragedy alike: in the former, Molière and even Regnard have surpassed Aristophanes, while "toutes les tragédies grecques me paraissent des ouvrages d'écoliers, en comparaison des *sublimes scènes* de Corneille, et des *parfaites tragédies* de Racine." And the standard of taste is higher in Paris than at Athens; there the theater-going public never exceeded ten thousand, and that including the lower classes; here, above thirty thousand souls, all of them men and women of culture, delight in the works of our great masters.

Walpole's last stricture had dealt with the French use of rhyme; but, says Voltaire, Dryden used it, so why not Corneille and Racine? "C'est une difficulté de plus." And he settles or evades the whole question with one of those anecdotes that are true to life if not to fact:

> Je demandais un jour à Pope pourquoi Milton n'avait pas rimé son poëme, dans le temps que les autres poëtes rimaient leurs poëmes, à l'imitation des Italiens; il me répondit: *Because he could not.*

And so, with a graceful compliment that ought to have made the conscience-stricken Walpole wish he had never mentioned those twin brethren, the Earl of Leicester and Dudley, the letter ends.

But now for the *tracasserie* that one comes to regard as almost inevitable in Voltaire's "little wars." He is evidently out to make mischief or at least to make a noise; accordingly, instead of sending his letter direct to Walpole, he sends it to Mme de Choiseul, who will pass it on to Mme du Deffand, who will finally send it to England—at every stage in its journey, then, it will be read, admired, discussed; and Voltaire sees in the discussion the germs of a very pretty little international dispute. To make assurance doubly sure, he sends Mme de Choiseul his own version of the affair,[1] not knowing, one imagines, that she had already been shown all the pieces of evidence by Mme du Deffand. It certainly cannot have occurred to him that she would take the drastic course of sending Walpole his letter to her, together with the long, full-dress letter it had covered.

There can be no doubt now, writes Mme du Deffand,[2] as to the intentions of Voltaire, and she repeats the advice she had given a month before.

Au nom de Dieu, ne donnez point dans ce panneau; tirez-vous de cette affaire le plus poliment qu'il vous sera possible, mais évitez la guerre; c'est le sentiment et le conseil de la grand' maman [Mme de Choiseul]; c'est celui du grand abbé [Barthélemy], et par-dessus tout, c'est le mien; je suis bien sûre aussi que ce sera le vôtre.

It was; the Choiseul letter shocked Walpole as much as his friends had anticipated—all the more, no doubt, because he himself had not found it easy to be straightforward with this treacherous antagonist.[3]

[1] "MADAME,

"La femme du protecteur est protectrice. La femme du ministre de la France pourra prendre le parti des Français contre les Anglais avec qui je suis en guerre. Daignez juger, Madame, entre M. Walpole et moi. Il m'a envoyé ses ouvrages dans lesquels il justifie le tyran Richard trois, dont ni vous ni moi ne nous soucions guère. Mais il donne la préférence à son grossier bouffon de Shakespeare sur Racine et sur Corneille, et c'est de quoi je me soucie beaucoup.

"Je ne sais par quelle voie M. Walpole m'a envoyé sa déclaration de guerre. Il faut que ce soit par M. le Duc de Choiseul, car elle est très-spirituelle et très-polie. Si vous voulez, Madame, être médiatrice de la paix, il ne tient qu'à vous; j'en passerai par ce que vous ordonnerez; je vous supplie d'être juge du combat. ...

"Vous me trouverez bien hardi, mais vous pardonnerez à un vieux soldat qui combat pour sa patrie, et qui, s'il a du goût, aura combattu sous vos ordres."

[2] Letter of July 21, 1768.

[3] Walpole's reply to Mme du Deffand's letter of July 21, quoted by Miss Berry, says: "Vous voyez la bonne foi de cet homme-là! Il me recherche, il me demande mon *Richard*, et puis il parle comme si je m'étais intrigué à le lui faire lire. Sa vanité est blessée de ce qu'on a osé lui donner un rival, et il a la faiblesse plus grande encore de vouloir le rejeter sur la part qu'il prend à l'honneur de Corneille et de Racine."

Accordingly he replies in a tone of ironical and overwhelming politeness, thanking Voltaire for his letter, but declining further controversy.

> One can never, Sir, be sorry to have been in the wrong, when one's errors are pointed out to one in so obliging and masterly a manner. Whatever opinion I may have of Shakespeare, I should think him to blame, if he could have seen the letter you have done me the honour to write to me, and yet not conform to the rules you have there laid down. When he lived, there had not been a Voltaire both to give laws to the stage, and to show on what good sense those laws were founded. . . . . But I will say no more on this head; for I am neither so unpolished as to tell you to your face how much I admire you, nor, though I have taken the liberty to vindicate Shakespeare against your criticisms, am I vain enough to think myself an adversary worthy of you. I am more proud of receiving laws from you than of contesting them.[1]

With his letter to Mme de Choiseul, Voltaire had even worse luck. She sent no direct reply at all,[2] and it was left for Mme du Deffand to try to patch up a peace in which neither she herself nor any of those concerned believed.

Though she had agreed with Walpole in condemning Voltaire's letter to Mme de Choiseul, she had enthusiastically praised the letter to Walpole himself,[3] and had refused to commit herself as to the rights of the case beyond temporizing with, "Tout ce que je sais, c'est que Voltaire a raison et que vous n'avez pas tort."[4] Thus it was that when the Maréchale de Luxembourg sent her a complete set of Voltaire's new quarto edition she was able to reply with not more than the average amount of insincerity, praising the answer to the Preface as "a masterpiece of taste, good sense, wit, eloquence, politeness, etc." But she was improvising rather too freely when she continued:

> M. de Walpole est bien converti: il faut lui pardonner ses erreurs passées. L'orgueil national est grand dans les Anglais; ils ont de la peine à nous

[1] Letter of July 27, 1768.

[2] "Je crois que nous ferons bien de le laisser tranquille, car pour moi, je ne veux point entrer dans une dispute littéraire. Je ne me sens pas en état de tenir tête à Voltaire, puis l'animadversion des gens de lettres me paraît la plus dangereuses des pestes" (Mme de Choiseul to Mme du Deffand, August 7, 1768). Cf. Mme du Deffand's letter to Walpole, July 27, 1768, which speaks of "la réponse indirecte qu'elle lui avait faite en m'écrivant."

[3] "C'est le dieu du style" (letter to Walpole of August 10, 1768).

[4] Letter to Walpole of August 23, 1768.

accorder la supériorité dans les choses de goût, tandis que sans vous nous reconnaîtrions en eux toute supériorité dans les choses de raisonnement.[1]

So far from Walpole's being converted, this very letter—one of those brought to Strawberry Hill after Mme du Deffand's death in 1780—bears a pencil note in his own hand to contradict this statement, and adding that had he known he would certainly not have allowed his well-meaning old friend to make it.

Mme du Deffand was, however, knocking at an open door. On this occasion at least Voltaire seems to have borne no malice, possibly because he was fully occupied at the moment by a very similar feud with the Président Hénault.[2] Like a true philosopher, he turned the affair to practical use, and quotes the *Historic Doubts* in two of his works.[3]

Walpole took things more seriously: he could forgive neither Voltaire's criticism of Shakespeare nor Voltaire's conduct toward himself. Accordingly, when Lady Ossory sent him a copy of one of these "honourable mentions," we find him coldly replying:

I saw long ago the passage your Ladyship took the trouble to transcribe. To be cited so honourably by Voltaire would be flattering indeed, if he had not out of envy taken pains to depreciate all the really great authors of his own country, and of this; and what sort of judgment is that which decries Shakespeare and commends me?[4]

His indignation on reading Voltaire's letter to d'Argental[5] on Letourneur's Shakespeare was extreme; he sends to Mason this "paltry

[1] Letter to Voltaire of August 14, 1768.

[2] Mme du Deffand to Walpole, October 5, 1768; Voltaire to Mme du Deffand, January 4, 1769.

[3] He says in his Preface to *Don Pèdre* (a tragedy finished in 1774, though begun much earlier, in which he takes the part of Pedro the Cruel of Castile against Henry of Trastamara): "Il ne faut pas s'étonner après cela si les historiens ont pris le parti du vainqueur contre le vaincu. Ceux qui ont écrit l'histoire en Espagne et en France n'ont pas été des Tacites; et M. Horace Walpole, envoyé d'Angleterre en Espagne [he is confusing the "noble author" with his uncle Horace, Lord Walpole] a eu bien raison de dire dans ses *Doutes sur Richard III*, comme nous l'avons remarqué ailleurs: 'Quand un roi heureux accuse ses ennemis, tous les historiens s'empressent de lui servir de témoins.'" Voltaire quotes the same maxim in *Le Pyrrhonisme dans l'histoire*, chap. xvii (1768). In his *Essai sur les mœurs* (definitive edition, 1756), he had already mentioned "l'ingénieux M. Walpole" when giving his account of the Wars of the Roses, in chaps. cxvi and cxvii.

[4] Letter to Lady Ossory, January 7, 1777.

[5] "Auriez-vous lu deux volumes misérables dans lesquels il [Letourneur] veut faire regarder Shakespeare comme le seul modèle de la véritable tragédie? Il l'appelle le Dieu du Théâtre ... il ne daigne pas nommer Corneille ou Racine: ces deux grands hommes sont seulement enveloppés dans la proscription générale sans que leurs noms soient prononcés. Il y a déjà deux tomes d'imprimés de ce Shakespeare, qu'on prendrait pour des pièces de la Foire, faites il y a deux cents ans. ... Ce qu'il y a d'affreux, c'est que le monstre a un parti en France, et pour comble de calamités, et d'horreur, c'est moi qui autrefois parlai le premier de ce Shakespeare; c'est moi qui le premier montrai aux Français quelques perles que j'avais trouvés dans son énorme fumier, etc." (letter of July 19, 1776).

scurrilous letter against Shakespeare, but it is not worth sending"; and explains: "I have a mind to provoke you, and so I send you this silly torrent of ribaldry. May the spirit of Pope that dictated your 'Musæus,' animate you to punish this worst of dunces, a genius turned fool with envy."[1]

The last of his references to Voltaire shows him still mindful of the ancient grudge:

> I . . . . was much pleased with the sight of both the letters of Voltaire and Mr. Windham. . . . . Both are curious in different ways. Voltaire's English would be good English in any other foreigner; but a man who gave himself the air of criticising our—and I will say the world's—greatest author, ought to have been a better master of our language, though this letter and his commentary prove that he could neither write it nor read it accurately and intelligently.[2]

M. B. Finch
E. Allison Peers

Cambridge, England

[1] Letter to Mason, September 17, 1776.

[2] Letter to Warton, December 9, 1784.

THE GRAIL AND THE ENGLISH "SIR PERCEVAL"

XI

Three Irish stories about "Finn and the Goblin" have been in print for some years, but have never before been brought into connection with *Sir Perceval* (*Sp*).[1] The oldest and rudest of these exists in eighth-century Irish, and is called "Finn and the Man in the Tree":[2]

When the *Fíana* were at Badamair on the brink of the Suir, Cúldub the son of Ua Birgge (Cúldub mac húi Birgge) came out of the *síd* (fairy-knoll) on the plain of Femen (ut Scotti dicunt) and carried off their cooking from them. For three nights he did thus to them. The third time however Finn knew and went before him [the goblin] to the fairy-knoll on Femen. Finn laid hold of him as he went into the knoll, so that he fell.

A fairy woman jammed Finn's finger between the door and post at the entrance of the knoll.

Another form of the story belongs to the ninth century and is called "How Finn Obtained Knowledge and the Death of the Fairy Cúldub":[3]

Every morning a man was told off to boil a pig for his [Finn's] day's food. Now once Oisín was told off to boil it. When he deemed it done, he passed it on the points of the fork over the litter into the hand of his comrade. Then something clutched at it. It passed out. He ran after it (the goblin) across the Suir, to wit, at Ath Nemthenn, across Ord, across Inmain, across the Slope of the Ui Faelain up to the summit of the Fairy Knoll on Femen plain. The door was shut after it when it had gone into the fairy-knoll, and Oisín was left outside. When the *Fíana* awoke, then Oisín came. "Where is the pig?" said Finn. "Some one braver than I has taken it," said Oisín.

On the next day Cailte took it. It was carried from him in the same manner. However, he came (back). "Where is the pig?" said Finn. "I am not braver than he from whom it was taken yesterday," said Cailte.

[1] The *Acallam* episode was mentioned by me in "The Bleeding Lance," *PMLA*, XXV (1910), p. 4.

[2] Edited and translated by Kuno Meyer, *Rev. Celt.*, XXV (1904), 344 f. On the date see Meyer, *Fianaigecht*, *RIA*, *Todd Lec. Series*, XVI (1910), p. xviii.

[3] *Ibid.*, XIV (1893), 245 f. On the date see *Fianaigecht*, p. xix.

"Who is to go now to boil it?" said Finn. "The younger thorn is always the sharper." He went himself to boil it, his spear hafts in his left hand, his other hand turning the pig on the points of the fork. Something clutched at it. Finn gave it (the goblin) a blow, but the point of his lance only reached its back. However, it left its load outside. It went into Ely, into Cell Ichtair Lethet. . . . . Seven times it jumped across the Suir. . . . . He made a thrust at it as it was going into the fairy-knoll so that thereby he broke its back. Finn stretched out his hand at the door-post of the fairy-knoll (*síd*), so that the door was closed on his thumb. He put it into his mouth, and heard their wail. "What is that?" they all said. "Cúldub has been killed!" "Who killed him?" said they. "Finn O'Baiscne." They all wail.

These Irish stories are identical in their main features. In both, Finn's company is injured by a goblin on successive occasions; in both, Finn pursues the goblin and slays or fells him just as he is entering the door of a fairy-knoll.

It appears that folk-tales were not written down by ancient Irish scribes (or if written down were not preserved) unless they were fitted into the history (or pseudo-history) of Ireland. It is Finn's great name that has preserved the stories just outlined, and doubtless the special reason why they were written down was because in the accident at the door of the knoll[1] they supplied a reason for Finn's well-known gift of foretelling the future by chewing his thumb.

These stories are mnemonic outlines intended to be filled out by the memory of the narrator. The tale of a spook, who, like the harpies of classic story, carries off your dinner, is certainly older than the eighth century, and was at first a floating bit of folk-lore ready to be attached to any hero. It accords with immemorial fairy belief still current in Celtic lands. Enchantment is not mentioned in either story, but the underlying idea is doubtless that Finn's company was enchanted by a hostile fairy just as in recently collected tales about cows that give no milk until malevolent fairies are sub-

[1] *Rev. Celt.*, XXV, 349. A more usual explanation attributes the power to Finn's having tasted the salmon of wisdom, *Macgnímartha Finn* (§ 18) (quoted below). References to this miraculous gift abound in Finn stories: *Cormac's Glossary*, *s.v.* Orc Tréith; *Fianaigecht*, p. xix; *Rev. Celt.*, XIII, 16, 21; Stokes, *Festschrift*, p. 10; *Silva Gadelica*, II, 98, 106, 135, 147, 163, 168–69, 233, 247; *Irische Texte*, IV, 248 (cf. Stokes's note, p. 288, l. 1834); MacDougall, *Folk and Hero Tales from Argyllshire* (1891), pp. 58, 274.

This gift, which is mentioned in the oldest accounts, is a valuable bit of evidence that Finn either was or became a *märchen* hero. The *märchen* formulas that resemble the Finn story ("Aryan Expulsion and Return," "Fated-Prince," usually, Woods, *PMLA*, XXVII, 527–30) ("Bärensohn," always, Panzer, *Studien zur Germ. Sagengeschichte*, I [1910], 3) ascribe supernatural gifts to the hero.

dued.[1] Probably only a destined hero armed with a magic spear could break the enchantment. A tenth-century Irish poem informs us that Cúldub was slain by Finn with Fiacail's spear.[2]

What appears to be a pre-Finn form of the tale of "Finn and the Goblin" is told both in the prose *Dindshenchas*, a collection which did not take shape until the twelfth century,[3] but which bristles with

[1] For example in S. Morrison, "The Silver Cup" in *Manx Fairy Tales* (1911), pp. 27 f., we read of a herd that gave no milk until their owner ended the enchantment by breaking into a fairy-knoll and stealing thence a silver cup. Cf. J. Curtin, *Tales of the Fairies* (1895), pp. 19 f.; Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West-Highlands*, II (1890), 47. A kindred idea is that of a demon who spoils your feast. This occurs in Panzer's "Bärensohn" formula, *op. cit.*, pp. 82–83 f., where snatching, defiling, or spitting demons are collected. A spitting demon who spoils a meal occurs in a North Carolina negro tale printed by Elsie Parsons, *JAFL*, XXX (1917), 179; cf. 186. An extraordinarily vivid tale where a cat is the aggressor is given by Thos. Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, Part I (1860), 112 f., *Chetham Society*, from a pamphlet printed in 1584. Another kindred idea is that of the demon hand; see Kittredge, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, VIII, 227–30. Haunted houses may be compared; see C. Mackay, *Memoirs of Extraordinary Delusions*, II (1841), 367; J. H. Ingram, *The Haunted Homes and Family Traditions of Great Britain* (1888); A. Lang, *Book of Dreams and Ghosts* (1897), pp. 187 f.; J. Ashton, *The Devil in Britain and America* (1896), p. 47; C. Crowe, *The Night-Side of Nature* (1850), p. 273; H. L. Neligan, *True Irish Ghost Stories* (1914); Kittredge, "The Friar's Lantern," *PMLA*, XV (1900), 435 f., and cf. C. H. Bompas, *Folk-Lore of the Santal-Parganas* (1909), p. 381. (Many of these references are due to the kindness of Professor T. P. Cross.) Cf. the idea of a meadow eaten down yearly on St. John's Day by supernatural beings, Dasent, *Popular Tales* (1859), p. 78. This is a variety of what Woods (*PMLA*, XXVII, 553) called "The Periodic Difficulty Theme." *The Battle of Mag Mucrime*, ed. Stokes, from *LL*, *Rev. Celt.*, XIII, 435 f., tells how King Ailill killed fairies that destroyed his grass and put his men to sleep with their magic song.

[2] The text is printed in *Fianaigecht*, p. xxiii, and a translation by Meyer in MacInnes, *Folk and Hero Tales* (1890), notes, p. 405:

"Aed MacFidaig fell by the hand of Find,
From the spear of Fiacail Mac Conchenn,
For the love he gave to the maiden of Brí Eile.
By the same spear Find killed
Cúldub Mac Fidga Forfind."

[3] On the date see *Fianaigecht*, p. xxvii. The story called *Móin Gae Glaiss* is No. 14 in the Rennes MS, and has been printed and translated by Stokes in *Rev. Celt.*, XV (1894), 305–6:

"Gae Glas son of Luinde son of Lug Liamna was Fiacha Srabtine's champion. 'Tis for him that the smith (*goba*) made the intractable spear. From the south Cúldub son of Dian went on the day of Hallowe'en (*samain*) to seek to slay some one, and he slew Fidrad son of Dam Dub, from whom *Ard Fidraid* is called. Then Gae Glas went a-following him and hurled at him the lance which the smith had made for him by magic, and it passed through Cúldub into the bog, and that lance was never found afterwards save once, when Mael-Odrán son of Dimma Cron, after he had been a year in the ground, found it and slew therewith Aithechdae king of Húi Máil. . . . . This lance was the *Carr* of Belach Duirgen: 'tis it that would slay thirty bands. Thus it was with a fork under its neck, and none save the Devil would move it. So long as the lance is with its point southwards the strength of Conn's Half of Ireland will not be broken by Leinster."

The "Death of Maelodrán" here referred to has been edited by Meyer, *Anec. Ox.*, VIII, Med. and Mod. Series, *Hibernica Minora* (1894), 78–81. It indicates that a demon was thought to dwell in the spear. This spear, because it is handed down as a talisman and given a name "Carr," resembles the spear of Lug, which is often mentioned in Irish stories and has a name "Luin." See my "Bleeding Lance," *PMLA*, XXV, 18, 24, 56.

older material, and in the verse *Dindshenchas*.[1] The hero is Grey Spear (*Gae Glas*), and he slays Cúldub with a cast of a spear in revenge for a wrong, just as Finn slew Cúldub in the stories already outlined. Both here and in the later and fuller account of "Finn and the Goblin," to be quoted presently from the *Acallam*, the spear is a magic weapon. In both the deed was done on Hallowe'en. It can hardly be fortuitous that in this story Fiacha Srabtine is the patron of the hero, while in the *Acallam* Fiacha mac Congha plays a similar part. Manifestly this story of *Gae Glas* is a variant of "Finn and the Goblin." The essential elements are the slaying of a supernatural foe by a magic spear.

A more complete form of the story of "Finn and the Goblin" is told in the *Acallam na Senórach*. Since this collection of tales exists in no MS older than the fifteenth century, it is necessary to consider what evidence attests the existence in the twelfth century of the tale in question.[2]

This evidence is, first, a precise mention of this *Acallam* in the twelfth-century prose *Dindshenchas*, which establishes the existence of at least some portion of the work at that time; and, second, some verses in the twelfth-century poem[3] of Gilla in Chomded, which allude to the very story in question.

The passage in the *Dindshenchas* is as follows:[4] "As Cáelte sang . . in Patrick's time for their diverse, marvellous *Acallam* (colloquy), which they made on Ireland's topographical legends." In the *Acallam*, as we know it, Oisín and Cáelte are the sole survivors of the *Fiana*, and Cáelte, just as the *Dindshenchas* declares, is the principal narrator. He goes about Ireland with Patrick and tells stories connected with the localities which they visit. The adjectives "diverse" and "marvellous" fit exactly the extant medley of wild and supernatural stories which Cáelte tells. Additions were

[1] Gwynn, *Metrical Dindshenchas*, "*Royal Irish Academy, Todd Lecture Series*," IX (1906), 64–65. The story agrees with that in the prose except that the smith who made the spear is given a name, "Aith."

[2] The *Acallam na Senórach*, or "Colloquy with the Ancients," may not have been put into final form before the thirteenth or fourteenth century (see Meyer, *Fianaigecht*, pp. xxx–xxxi), but there is no reason to think that it shows any traces of influence coming from French romance.

[3] The poem is in *LL*, p. 144*b*, a MS older than 1150. It has been edited and translated by Meyer, *Fianaigecht*, pp. 46–51.

[4] Ed. Stokes, *Rev. Celt.*, XV, 437–38, 45.

from time to time thrust into the main framework,[1] but it is incredible that the writer of these lines in the *Dindshenchas* did not know at least some portion of the work which we now have.

The verses of Gilla in Chomded are as follows: "In the eighth year of his (Finn's) life, when he was visiting Dathi's Tara, he slew [Aillén][2] whose hand was full with candle . . . . with *timpán*. 'A *timpán* for sleep' say all, the practice at each Hallowe'en, a customary deed; every year, lasting incitement, the candle was burning brightly."

The statements of these verses agree, as will be seen, exactly with the details given in the *Acallam*.[3] Both describe the incident as Finn's first significant exploit, and locate it at Tara. Both ascribe to an uncanny foe the two powers of fire and of music, and use the same word for the musical instrument: the *timpán*, which in both charms men to sleep. Both relate that this foe made visits at every Hallowe'en. No one can doubt that Gilla in Chomded knew the episode of "Finn and the Goblin" substantially as we have it. "Finn and the Goblin," therefore, belongs to the oldest portion of the *Acallam* and existed in the twelfth century. The reader will observe that the story centers round a talismanic spear which resembles the Luin, a fairy weapon famous in Irish tradition. An outline of the episode is as follows:[4]

(Cáelte is speaking to Ilbrecc.) "That is the spear of Fiacha mac Congha by means of which it was that at the first Finn son of Cumall acquired chief command of Ireland's *Fiana;* and out of Finnachaidh's green-grassed *síd* 'twas brought. For it was Aillén mac Midhna of the Tuatha dé Danaan that out of Carn Finnachaidh to the northward used to come to Tara: the manner of his coming being with a musical *timpán* in his hand, the which whenever any heard he would

[1] See Stokes, *Irische Texte*, IV, x–xii. Dr. Douglas Hyde has found "a second equally long *Acallam* of different contents," *Fianaigecht*, p. xxxi. I have not been able to examine this.

[2] The name of the goblin is missing from the MS, but has been supplied by Meyer from the *Acallam*. The context makes a reference to the story of "Finn and the Goblin" certain. See Meyer, *Fianaigecht*, pp. 46–51.

[3] The sole discrepancy is of no importance. According to the poem, at the time of the adventure Finn was eight years old; according to the *Acallam* he was ten.

[4] O'Grady's translation, *Silva Gadelica*, II, 142–44, corrected according to Stokes's notes, *Irische Texte*, IV, 1 (1900), 287–88. Stokes edits the Irish text from four MSS, pp. 47–50, ll. 1654–1771.

at once sleep." Every year on Hallowe'en (*samhain*) the fairy or goblin used to come, lull everyone to sleep with his *timpán*, and then emit a blast of fire out of his mouth. "With his breath he used to blow up the flame and so, during a three-and-twenty years' spell, yearly burnt up Tara with all her gear. That was the period when the battle of Cnucha was fought, in which fell Cumall son of Trenmor. . . . ."

"After the death of Cumall the chieftainship of the *Fíana* was made over to the great-deeded Goll mac Morna, who held it for ten years. But a son had been born to Cumall, which was Finn; and up to the age of ten years he was (perforce) a-marauding and a-trespassing. In this his tenth year Tara's Feast was made by the king, Conn, the Hundred Fighter: and as all Ireland drank and enjoyed themselves in the great house of the Midchuart," the youth Finn appeared before them. "The king of Ireland looked at the youth; for to him and to the others in the *bruidhen* the youth was unknown." The king put his horn of state into the youth's hand and inquired: "Whose boy is this?" "I am Finn mac Cumall . . . . son to the warrior that formerly held the chieftainship of the *Fíana*, and I am come to procure my friendship with thee." So Conn took Finn into his service.

"Then with a smooth and polished drinking-horn that was in his hand the king of Ireland stood up and said: 'If, men of Ireland, I might find among you one that until the point of rising day upon the morrow should preserve Tara that she be not burnt by Aillén mac Midhna, his rightful heritage . . . . I would bestow on him.' " After the others had refused the offer, Finn took it up, and Conn gave securities that Finn if successful should receive his heritage.

After this "Fiacha mac Congha that to Finn's father Cumall had been a young man of trust," without the knowledge of the sons of Morna or anybody else, furnished Finn with "a certain spear of deadly property and with which no devious cast was ever made."

Finn thereupon went out to defend Tara against the goblin.

It was not long before he heard a plaintive strain, and to his forehea he held the flat of the spear-head and its point. Aillén began and played his *timpán* till he had lulled everyone else to sleep, and then to consume Tara emitted from his mouth his blast of fire. But to this Finn opposed the

crimson fringed mantle which he wore so that the flame fell down through the air carrying with it the fourfold mantle a twenty-six span's depth into the earth; whereby *ard na teinedeh* or "fire hill" is the name of that eminence. . . . . When Aillén was aware that his magical contrivance was all baffled he returned to *sídh Finnachaidh* on the summit of *sliabh Fuaid.* Thither Finn followed him and, putting his finger into the spear's thong as Aillén passed in at the door of the *síd,* delivered a well-calculated and successful throw that entered Aillén in the upper part of his back, and in form of a great lump of black blood drove his heart out through his mouth. Finn beheaded him, carried the head back to Tara and fixed it upon a stake.

To Aillén then his mother came and, after giving way to great grief, went to seek a leech for him:

Come hither O she-physician of Amairtha: by Fiacha mac Congha's spear, by the fatal mantle and by the pointed javelin, Aillén mac Midhna is slain! Alas! Aillén is fallen. . . . . Come hither out of [Benn] Boirche, O she-physician! . . . . Blithe was Aillén mac Midhna of Sliabh Fuaid, nine times he burnt up Tara!

After this victory over the goblin Conn gave Goll his choice, either to quit Ireland or to lay his hand in Finn's, and Goll chose to serve Finn. Finn received the chieftainship of the *Fiana* and held it till he died. And it was by this spear "that Finn ever and always had all his fortune, and the spear's constant original name was *birgha* or 'spit-spear.'"

According to this longer account, the goblin is named Aillén, not Cúldub, and instead of carrying off a portion of a feast, he burns the king's city. But Finn slays him with the spear of Fiacail just as he did Cúldub, and in both cases the cast of the spear takes effect just as the goblin is entering his fairy-knoll. In both cases the goblin has made repeated visits, and only Finn is successful in conquering him. The stories are essentially the same. Here as in the other stories the spear is a talisman: "By means of this spear Finn ever and always had all his fortune." Evidently all three forms of "Finn and the Goblin" belong together, and are in fact variants of one story.

XII

A comparison of the different forms of "Finn and the Goblin" shows that the essential elements in the story are the recurrent molestation of a feast by a malevolent fairy who is finally slain by

a youthful hero with a marvelous spear. These are also the striking features in the English *Sir Perceval* (*Sp*), as a summary of the romance will make clear:

Sir Perceval the elder, father of the hero, frequents tournaments where his bitterest opponents are the Red Knight and the Black. The Red Knight by the aid of "wicked armour" kills him "in battle and in fight." The mother Acheflour with the infant Perceval and one maid goes to a forest, where she brings the boy up in ignorance of the way men fight. Of the father's belongings she takes only a little "scottes spere." As the boy grows up he uses the spear to kill birds and deer, which he brings to his mother. When he is about fifteen years old, he meets in the forest three of Arthur's knights. From them he learns about King Arthur. He runs down a wild mare, mounts it, and rides home to his mother, telling her that he is going to Arthur's court to be made knight. He carries with him his father's spear, a ring that his mother gives him, and sets out on the mare, having no bridle except a withy.

He finds a lady in a hall (we are told in another place that she is wife to the Black Knight) and exchanges rings with her (we learn later that the ring which he gets by exchange preserves the wearer from death and wounds). King Arthur is seated at his Christmas feast when the youth all roughly accoutered rides into the hall. The boy does not know his name, but Arthur calls him "fair child" and says that if he were well dressed he would resemble the elder Perceval. At this moment the Red Knight enters, seizes a golden cup from before the king, and rides away with it. Arthur says that for fifteen years the Red Knight has done this and no one can stop him unless it be Sir Perceval's son; "the books say that he shall avenge his father's death." Arthur promises to reward the youth with knighthood provided that he will strike down the Red Knight. Arthur goes to fetch armor, but Perceval, without waiting, pursues the Red Knight and slays him with a single cast of his "scottes spere" that pierces him through the eye. Perceval covets the red armor, but not knowing how to unlace it, tries to burn the Red Knight's body out. Sir Gawain coming up shows Perceval how to unlace the red armor and buckle it on. Perceval sends Gawain back to Arthur with the golden cup. Perceval meets with the Witch

Mother who, because of the red armor, mistakes him for her son, the Red Knight, and remarks that though he were slain, she could restore him to life unless he were burned. Whereupon Perceval kills her and burns her body likewise.

Perceval spends the night with an old man (who, as we learn later, is his uncle). He hears from a messenger that Lufamour the Queen of Maidenland is in trouble, and he sets off alone to rescue her. He slays a "sowdan" named Gollerotherame who was besieging Maidenland and marries the rescued Lufamour. After a stay of one year Perceval sets out to find his mother. In the forest he meets a weeping lady who tells him that she is being punished by her husband the Black Knight because she has lost her ring. Perceval overcomes the Black Knight and reconciles him to the lady. Perceval finds that a giant, a brother of Gollerotherame, has driven his mother to insanity by making her believe that he has killed her son. He slays the giant, cures his mother by means of a drink which he finds in the giant's house, and returns happily with her to Maidenland.

The parallelism between *Sp* and the story of "Finn and the Goblin" in the *Accallam* (*A*) may be summed up as follows: In both, the scene is at the court[1] of the king of the land and at a great feast held at a yearly festival (Christmas or Hallowe'en). In both, the land has been enchanted since the slaying of the hero's father by a supernatural warrior who has insulted and injured the king each year at a festival. In both, the youthful hero is unknown at court, but is recognized by the king. In both no one but the youthful hero ventures to attack the supernatural foe. In both, the youthful hero, who without knowledge of the court is equipped with a spear furnished by a relative (mother or uncle), slays the enchanter by a cast of his spear. In both, the enchanter or goblin has a

[1] Tara, the capital city of the Irish king, had been bewitched for twenty-three years, we are told, although we read later that Finn was but ten years old, and that Aillén had nine times burnt Tara, which seems to prove that the spell had lasted but ten years. *Sp* has a similar discrepancy about the duration of the enchantment. Fifteen years have elapsed since the Red Knight killed Perceval's father, and yet we read "Fyfe ȝeres hase he þus gane" (633) (where Holthausen emends to "Fyftene"); and again "Sythen taken hase he three [cups]" (637), which might mean that but three Hallowe'ens had passed. Whatever explanation we may adopt for these inconsistencies, it is reasonable to hold that in both narratives the enchantment must have rested upon the land from the time when the hero's father was slain until the youthful hero, aided by his father's magic arms, slew the enchanter.

supernatural mother, and there is talk of a possibility of restoring the enchanter to life.

In the Irish, Finn kills the goblin with the cast of a spear just as the latter is entering his fairy-knoll. That the fairy man is slain at the entrance to his subterranean dwelling is probably a primitive idea. It occurs in all the Irish versions. In the English *Sp* a rather distinct trace of this fairy-knoll remains. Perceval kills the Red Knight with a cast of his father's spear at a hill. This might at first appear an ordinary hill, but after Perceval has slain the Red Knight and put on the armor, Gawain remarks: "Goo we faste fro this hill . . . . it neghes nere nyghte" (806–8), which is a pointless remark unless the hill be a fairy-knoll (*sid*), near which it would, of course, be dangerous to tarry at night. It seems safe to conclude, therefore, that the hill which is mentioned five times (697, 780, 806, 838, 845) is a surviving trace of the Red Knight's *sid* or fairy abode.

The spear with which Finn killed the goblin was given him by his uncle Fiacail. Since the father, Cumall, had many treasures and talismans,[1] and since Fiacail had been to Cumall "a young man of trust," this spear may have belonged to Finn's father; anyhow it was a talismanic spear that brought good luck, and it came from fairyland. The spear in *Sp* was the only one of the father's belongings that was carried away by the mother to the forest and given to the son. It is not definitely called a talisman, but the progress of the action makes this a highly probable conjecture.

The scene in the Irish where King Conn, after complaining of the yearly depredations of his uncanny foe, offers to restore to any man who will ward off this enemy his rightful heritage (in Finn's case, of course, the command of the *Fiana*) is like that in *Sp*, where Arthur after complaining of the yearly ravages of the Red Knight offers to make Perceval a knight (that is, to receive him into the company of the warriors) provided that he recover the cup from the Red Knight.

'Als I am trewe king,' said he,
'A knyghte sall I make the,
For-thi þou wille brynge mee
The coupe of golde bryghte.' 648.[2]

[1] See John McNeill, *Dunaire Finn*, pp. 21 f., 34 f., 119 f., 135 f.

[2] There is no parallel in *A* to the recovery of the cup. When the king stood up to speak to Finn, he held "a polished drinking-horn in his hand."

The central incident in *Sp* appears then to belong to what may be called the "Finn and the Goblin" type. In *Sp*, however, the "Goblin" incident is a part of an *enfances* framework. Now a "Goblin" episode as a part of an *enfances* framework occurs in an Irish story, the *Macgnímartha Finn* (*M*),[1] the resemblance of which to *Sp* is so close that it has been noticed repeatedly. *M* owes its preservation, no doubt, to the fact that it was told as heroic saga and was made a part of the supposed history of Finn. In the process of adapting it to history the marvelous elements out of which it has been built up have become obscured, but a little study of it will reveal that it belonged originally to the group of *enfances féeriques*. The importance of *M* has not been hitherto generally recognized because of the accident that it exists in no MS older than the fifteenth century. Before the recent advances in Irish scholarship it was usually referred to as a fifteenth-century tale.[2] One could urge, therefore (if he were sufficiently resolute), that it might be a decayed and confused version of French Arthurian romance; that it might possibly be a last stage of deterioration from literary forms, rather than a genuine survival of the living folk-tale out of which as a germ literary Arthurian romances grew. Any hypothesis of this sort is now shown to be impossible because of the evidence that *M* was in existence substantially in its present form in the twelfth century, and is therefore too old to be explained by French romance.

Twenty years ago students of Irish were not sufficiently sure of the history of grammatical forms to assert that an Irish saga text was ancient unless it was contained in *LU* (a MS written before 1106),[3] or in *LL* (a MS of 1150). The development of Irish scholarship has now made it certain that many texts which exist solely in later MSS belong almost or quite in their present form to the twelfth century or earlier. Evidence has been accumulating that

[1] "The Youthful Exploits of Finn," which exists in a MS of 1453, but is declared to be a copy of older documents. It has been edited by Meyer, *Rev. Celt.*, V (1881–83), 195–204; cf. his corrections, *Archiv f. Celt. Lex.*, I, 482; and translated by him, *Eriu*, I (1904), 180–90. On its resemblance to *Sp*, see Nutt, *Folk-Lore Record*, IV (1881), 9 f.; *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail* (1888), pp. 152 f.; Griffith, *Sir Perceval*, Chicago dissertation, 1911.

[2] E.g., Nutt, *Folk and Hero Tales*, ed. MacInnes (1891), p. 415.

[3] Compare my procedure in "Iwain," *Harvard Studies and Notes*, VIII (1903) 27 f. On *LU* see Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight* (1916), pp. 290 f.

M,[1] though in a fifteenth-century MS, and though the language contains some later forms, is in truth one of these older texts. Professor Kuno Meyer, the latest editor of *M*, entirely without reference to its possible relations to *Sp*, unhesitatingly declares it to be a composition of the twelfth century.[2] We shall see that several Irish texts which exist in twelfth-century MSS, notably the *Fotha Catha Cnucha*[3] and a poem beginning *A Rí richid* by Gilla in Chomded,[4] establish this dating beyond a doubt. Taken together they indicate a knowledge in the twelfth century of most of the incidents of *M*. I will print summaries of these two important twelfth-century texts in parallel to a summary of *M*,[5] so that in the case of each incident the guaranty for its existence in the twelfth century may be clear at a glance. The *Fotha Catha*[6] ends before the point at which Gilla in Chomded's poem begins so that both can be arranged in one column.

The following table will also serve another purpose. By printing a summary of *Sp* in a third column all incidents which are parallel in *Sp* and *M* appear, and the extent to which these incidents can be proved to have been known in the twelfth century becomes apparent.

[1] For references see an article by Professor Pace in *PMLA*, XXXII (1917), 598–604. To Pace's materials I am able to add the evidence of two twelfth-century Irish documents, and partly by the help of these documents I believe it possible to show that the number of incidents common to *Sp* and *M* is nearer twelve than seven, the number which he observed. Pace's article is one of promise, and I regret to note his recent death while on military relief work in France.

[2] *Fianaigecht* (1910), p. xxviii. Long since Meyer asserted that the presence of Old-Irish forms fixes the date of a text. Even if we were to assume that some later scribe had tried to deceive us, his knowledge would have been insufficient to enable him to insert genuine Old-Irish grammatical forms. The later scribes had a desire to change grammatical forms of the older language into modern forms, but "few had sufficient knowledge of the older language to enable them to do so correctly. The later the period, the less Old-Irish was understood, the greater their difficulties of dealing intelligently with extinct forms," Meyer, *Anec. Oxon.* (1894), VIII, viii. "I think that if in a late copy we find among modern surroundings Old-Irish forms almost or entirely unchanged occurring with any frequency we may safely assume that we have then a copy which is ultimately derived from an Old-Irish source," *ibid.*, p. x. The researches of Strachan, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1894 ff., are of fundamental importance for the dating of Irish texts.

[3] "Cause of the Battle of Cnucha," which has been edited and translated from *LU* by Hennesey, *Rev. Celt.*, II (1873–75), 86 f., and has been edited by Windisch, *Kurzgefasste Ir. Gram.* (1879), pp. 121 f. Cf. also Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. xxv. The *Fotha Catha* is told, not as heroic saga like *M*, but as veritable history, and all traces of the marvelous have been removed.

[4] Edited and translated by Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–51.

[5] From Meyer's translation, *Eriu*, I (1904), 180–90.

[6] From Hennessy's translation, *Rev. Celt.*, II, 91 f. I give the section numbers of the editors named.

Fotha Catha	*M*	*Sp*
	§§ 1 and 2	
Cumall fought a battle against Urgriu and Aed son of Daire *derg* (also called Morna). Cumall was slain by Aed. The latter lost an eye by the spear of Luchet, and was thereafter called Goll.	Cumall mac Trénmór was slain in the battle of Cnucha by Aed who lost an eye by the spear of Luchet and was thereafter called Goll (i.e. the one-eyed).[1] Goll was son of Daire *derg* (the Red), also called Morna, and he displaced Cumall as captain of the *fian*. "The man who kept Cumall's treasure-bag wounded Cumall in the battle." Another foe was Urgriu.	The elder Perceval, father of the hero, was "Slayne in batelle and in fighte" by the Red Knight (161–62).
	§ 3	
(One stanza of a poem almost exactly as in *M*.)	(Verses describing the fight.)	
	§ 4	
Muirne bore a son called Demni (later called Finn). The boy was nursed up secretly "in the house of Fiacail mac Conchind . . . . for a sister to Cumall was Fiacail's wife, Bodball Bendron."	After the battle Cumall's wife Muirne bore a son Demne (later called Finn). Two women-warriors (*dá banfeindig*), Bodbmall *bandrai*,[2] and the Grey One of Luachair (*in Liath Luachra*),[3] with the help of Fiacail mac Conchinn carried away the boy, for the mother "durst not let him be with her." The two women-warriors brought up the boy secretly in the forest of Slieve	(Perceval was born before his father's death 101–4). P. was carried by his mother and one maid to a wood and there reared (163 f.).

[1] Aed means "fire." "Fire son to Daire the Red" may plausibly be the origin of the Red Knight in *Sp*. Aed was a common Irish name, but it may have been common because men were named after a demi-god. Cf. *Cormac's Glossary, s.v. Aod, Anecdota from Irish MSS*, IV, 4, 33. According to Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum, Hib.*, I, xxviii, the life of St. Aed shows traces of borrowings from a fire-deity. (The saint's qualities, however, might have been suggested solely by his name.)

[2] She evidently corresponds to Bodball Bendron in the *Fotha Catha*. Bendron is perhaps to be emended to *bandrai*, "sorceress." The *Fotha Catha* reveals the fact that Fiacail was Finn's uncle. A twelfth-century poem by Gilla Modutu in *LL* printed in *Fianaigecht*, p. xxix, calls Bodball "Finn's foster-mother (*a mummi maith*).

[3] This person is a woman, and cannot be identical with Liath Luachra, a warrior who, intrusted with Cumall's treasure bag, wounded Cumall in the battle, and was later slain by Finn.

Fotha Catha	*M*	*Sp*
	§ 4	
	Bloom. "That was indeed necessary for many a sturdy stalwart youth and many a venomous hostile warrior and angry fierce champion . . . . of the sons of Morna were lying in wait for that boy."	
	§ 5	
	After six years the mother Muirne passed through one wilderness to another until she visited her son in the forest of Slieve Bloom. She was "afraid of the sons of Morna for him." She left him in charge of the women-warriors, bidding them take charge of the boy till he should be fit to be a warrior.	
	§ 6	
	Finn went hunting alone and "cut off at a shot the feathers and wings" of a duck upon a lake.	Perceval shot small birds (217–24).
	§ 7	
	He was for a time in the house of Fiacail mac Codna, but the two women-warriors carried him away with them again.	Perceval does not know his name: "I ame myn awnn modirs childe."
Gilla in Chomded's poem	§ 8	
§§ 2–4	He entered a game of hurley against a band of youths.	
Glaisdic was [Finn's] name originally. The sons of Morna named him Finn.	§§ 9 and 10	King Arthur calls him, "Faire childe and free" (501–6).
	They called him Finn ("the fair")[1] on account of his shapeliness.	

[1] That the parallel to *Sp* at this point is significant is proved by the occurrence of something similar to the name "the fair" in almost all stories of the sort: In Chrétien the mother calls her son "Biax filz" (353); in *Bl*, "Biaus fius" (ed. Potvin, 1232); in Wolfram, "bon fîz, scher fîz, bêâ fîz" (113, 4; 140, 6); in *Li Biaus Desconeûs*, "biel fil," vs. 117; in *Libeaus Desconus*, "Beau fis" (ed. Kaluza, vss. 26, 66); in *Mériadeuc*, "le biel vallet" (10774); in the *Prose Lancelot*, "le biau trove," etc. (ed. Sommer, III, 22). In the *Enfances Gauvain* the boy is called "bel fil," *Romania*, XXXIX, 22, 2d frg. 32.

Gilla in Chomded	*M*	*Sp*
	§ 11	
"Seven years he was in hard plight, under Loch Ree he found 'fair help'[1] (findchobair)." "Finn's first race . . . . into Loch Corrib from Loch Ree around Connaught."	He found the youths swimming. "He jumps into the lake to them, and drowns nine of them in the lake." People said, "Finn drowned the youths," so that henceforth the name Finn clave to him.	
	§ 12	
	Once a "fleet herd of wild deer" was seen by him, and he ran down two bucks among them, and brought them to the two women-warriors. He was hunting in this wise till one day the women-warriors said to him, "Go now from us for the sons of Morna are watching to kill thee."	"þer wes no beste þat welke one fote, To fle fro hym was it no bote, When þat he wolde hym have" (222–24).
§ 11		He saw a group of wild mares, ran down the biggest and rode on it to his mother (325–64).
He ran a race with the deer of Fiaclach mac Conchenn.		
	§ 13	
	After this he took service with the King of Bantry, and no hunter was his equal. And the king said, "If Cumall had left a son one would think thou wast he."	Arthur thinks if he were well dressed he would resemble the elder Perceval.
§ 16		
Seven deer by Slieve Bloom was Finn's first chase, ... a brave and stout exertion.		
	§ 14	
	A similar incident occurred while he was in service to the King of Kerry.	"And ever more trowed hee, þat þe childe scholde bee Sir Percyvell son" (545–88).
§ 28		
"Thirty jewels . . . . Finn took out of the jaws of the crane-bag, after he had slain Glonna[2] at the vast ford, and Liath Luachra of the swift deeds."		
	§ 15	
	A chief smith named Lochán made two spears for him, and with one of them he slew a famous sow and brought the head for a bridal gift to the smith's daughter.	
	§ 16	
§ 5	A weeping woman told Finn that her son Glonda had been slain by "a tall, very terrible warrior." Finn "went in pur-	Perceval found a weeping woman tied to a tree by her husband the

[1] "*Findchobair*" may be a name for Finn's foster-mother or *mumme*.

[2] The Irish (*iar n-guin Glonda*) merely says "after the slaying of Glonna and Liath Luachra" and need not necessarily contradict *M*, according to which Liath Luachra slew Glonna.

Gilla in Chomded	*M*	*Sp*
§ 5	§ 16	
when he was visiting Dathi's Tara, he slew [Aillén] whose hand was full with candle . . . . with *timpán.*	suit of the warrior, and they fight a combat, and he fell by him. This is how he was: he had the treasure bag with him, to wit the treasures of Cumall. He who had fallen there was Liath Luachra ("The Grey One of Luachair") who had dealt the first wound to Cumall in the Battle of Cnucha."	Black Knight. He overcame the Black Knight (1817–1932).
§ 6	§§ 17–19	
"'A *timpán* for sleep,' said all, the practice at each Hallowe'en a customary deed, every year."	Finn visited Crimall mac Trénmór [his uncle]. He went to learn poetry from Finnéces on the Boyne, and he tasted the salmon of wisdom. "He durst not remain in Ireland else, until he took to poetry, for fear of the son of Urgriu, and of the sons of Morna."	He slew the Red Knight not knowing that he was the one who slew his father (629–40, 689–92, 709).
§ 8	§ 20	
"For fear of sword-fierce Conn Finn went to learn noble poetry. Cethern mac Fintain was his tutor in poetic composition."	(A poem by which Finn proved his skill.)	
§ 9	§ 21	
"After a feast the *fiana* bring Finn to avenge the poet Orcbél, the fairy woman from Slieve Slánga had achieved the fierce, bold deed . . . . this was his journey on that night from Bri Ele."	Finn went to Cethern mac Fintan further to learn poetry with him. They both went to woo a maiden in the fairy-knoll of Bri Ele. Every year at Hallowe'en the fairy knolls of Ireland were open, and every Hallowe'en a man of Ireland went to woo this maiden, but it always happened that some man belonging to the wooer's company was slain.	
§ 13	§ 22	
"In revenge of the poet Orcbél Finn slew Ua Fid-	As Finn and Cethern went toward the fairy-knoll, Oircbel the poet, one of their people was slain.	

Gilla in Chomded	*M*	*Sp*
§ 13 ga . . . with the spear of Fiaclach mac Conchind."	§ 23 Finn was angry and went to the house of Fiacail for advice. Fiacail gave Finn a spear and told him to watch the fairy mounds on Hallowe'en.	
§ 14 "Two staves Finn heard."	§ 24 Finn watched until the fairy-knoll opened, cast Fiacail's spear, and killed a fairy-man, Aed mac Fidga.	
§ 15 "'Venom is the spear' was the powerful beginning of the second stave . . . . there after the deed of valour on bright Allhallowe'en he heard them."	§ 25 Finn heard the fairies lament and repeat a quatrain, "Venom is the spear," etc.	
	§ 26 Finn recovered his spear by seizing a fairy-woman as hostage for its return.	
§ 17 "A vessel full of gold, of glorious silver, the woman out of Slieve Slánga gave to him; we know for certain that this was the first fair treasure that he took to the *fian* for noble distribution."	§ 27 Finn vied with Fiacail[1] his uncle in feats of strength.	Perceval spent the night with his uncle who was the father of nine sons (936 f., 1050).
	§ 28 Fiacail set Finn to watch asking to be waked if he heard any (cry of) outrage. Finn heard a cry in the night, and did not wake Fiacail, but pursued alone and overtook three fairy-women outside the green mound of Slieve Slanga. He snatched a brooch from one of them. She asked back her brooch, and promised a reward. (The sentence is incomplete and the conclusion is supplied by Meyer from the poem of Gilla in Chomded [§ 17].)	Perceval sent back his three cousins on some pretext, and traveled on alone to an adventure (1033 f.). He won the love of Lufamour in Maidenlande (1221–1815).

[1] From the *Fotha Catha* we learn that Fiacail was Finn's uncle by marriage. In 17–19 above, Finn visited Crimall, his father's brother. In *Sp* the hero visited Arthur and the old man with nine sons. Both were uncles. In *Peredur* the hero visited two uncles in succession and engaged in feats of arms. In Chrêtien Gornemans is an uncle and he taught the use of arms. Clearly an uncle who teaches the hero skill in arms is a part of the story formula we are studying.

This table shows that most of the events in *M* are attested by texts which exist in twelfth-century MSS. It shows further a remarkable parallelism between *M* and *Sp*. First it may be well to observe that *M* contains some episodes that correspond to nothing in *Sp*. These are: the visit of the mother[1] (5); the hero's stay as a child with his uncle, and the game of hurley (7–9); his drowning nine youths in a lake (11); his love affair with the daughter of Locan the smith (15); his learning poetry, tasting the salmon of wisdom, and his revenge on the fairy folk for slaying Oircbel the poet (17–26). It is also true that a few incidents in *Sp* find no parallel in *M:* the hero's encounter with the Red Knight's witch mother; his battle with a second giant (Gollerotherame's brother, 2005 f.); and his rescue of his mother. An *enfances* framework is meant to hold episodes, and the insertion of a number of episodes into *M*, or the omission of a few from *Sp*, in nowise invalidates the approximate identity of the framework of the two stories. The significant fact is that some twelve incidents are common to the older Irish and to the English story. Since these incidents occur in the same order in both[2] the parallelism cannot possibly be fortuitous. The framework of the two stories is the same.

Both the Irish *M* and the English *Sp* relate (1) that the hero's father was slain in battle; (2) that he was reared far from men by two women; (3) that he showed skill in killing birds; (4) that he was swift enough of foot to run down wild animals; (5) that his real name was concealed; (6) that a king suspects his identity; (7) that he was called "The Fair One" (Finn), or "faire child"; (8) that he

[1] In *Li Biaus Desconeüs* the mother visits the hero while he is with his fairy nurse, so that this incident is probably original, and has been dropped in *Sp*.

[2] The parallel to the youth's being called Finn ("the fair"), §§ 9–10, occurs at a slightly later place in *Sp*, but is an idea that might have been mentioned more than once. The only real transposition of incident is in § 16, where the weeping woman occurs near the end of *Sp*, and the reason for it is clearly a difference in plot. *Sp* divides Liath Luachra into two figures, a Red Knight and a Black, both enemies, whom the hero encounters separately. The Black Knight is subdued but not slain. In *M* the hero avenges at one stroke both the weeping woman and his father.

A tenth-century Irish poem, quoted above, p. 27, tells of two fairy foes, Aed mac Fidaig and Cúldub mac Fidga, who were successively slain by Finn with Fiacail's spear. Gilla in Chomded likewise knows two foes, one a fire goblin, another the fairy man who "was slain about the maiden of Bri Eile." In these goblin brothers (for Fidaig and Fidga are probably the same patronymic) it is tempting to trace the origin of the Red Knight and the Black Knight in *Sp* who were successively overcome by Perceval. Aed means "fire" or "red." *Cúl dub* means "black back."

avenged a weeping woman; (9) and avenged himself unwittingly on a mysterious man who had killed or helped to kill his father; (10) that he visited his uncle's house; (11) that he rid himself of the companionship of his uncle, or his cousins, to go alone; (12) that he had an adventure with a damsel at a fairy-knoll ("Maiden Land" in *Sp*).

All of these parallels are guaranteed by twelfth-century Irish references except (3), (8), and (11). No. (3) certainly belongs to the Irish *enfances* formula because it is one of the exploits of the youthful Cuchulinn.[1] No. (8), although Gilla in Chomded does not mention the significant detail of the weeping woman, was almost certainly known to him.[2] His statement, "Thirty jewels Finn took out of the crane-bag after the slaying of Glonna and Liath Luachra," agrees precisely, as far as it goes, with *M*. Because of this exact agreement one can hardly go wrong in assuming that the omission of the weeping woman is a mere accident occasioned by the laconic style of the poet. No. (11) is, probably, the sole parallel left without guarantee. Its omission would not perceptibly weaken our evidence.

No argument is needed to establish the existence of a literary connection between Irish and English. The parallelism is too complete to be fortuitous. Furthermore this parallelism extends beyond mere folklore to details that appear to be the work of literary elaboration. Compare, for example, the speech of the King of Kerry in the Irish to that of King Arthur in the English (in both Irish and English the king is addressing a youthful hero whose identity is unknown). The King of Kerry says:

"If Cumall had left a son, one would think thou wast he." (*M*, § 13). King Arthur says:

> And þou were wele dighte,
> þou were lyke to a knighte,
> þat I lovede with all my myghte,
> Whills he was one lyve. 548.

The changes that appear in the English version are exactly of the sort that one might expect the author of a romance of chivalry to

[1] Cuchulinn killed a swan. See Windisch, *Irische Texte*, extraband (1905), p. 163.

[2] Poets assume that their hearers understand allusions, and the problem of restoring a folk-tale from references to it in Middle-Irish poems is something like what it would be, e.g., to restore the classical tale of Arethusa from Milton's allusions to it in *Lycidas*.

make. The emphasis placed on good clothes ("wele dighte") is to be noted as showing that the English version is addressed to a different state of society from that in which the Irish arose.

In both Irish and English the hero leaves his uncle to go alone to an adventure with a fairy woman. In the Irish we read:

"Finn did not wake the warrior. He went alone" (*M*, § 28). The English version runs:

> Ever he sende one a-gayne
> At ilke a myle ende,
> un-till þay ware all gane;
> þan he rydes hym allane. 1042.

Some significant connection between Irish and English is indicated by the way in which most of the personages in the English may be matched by like personages in the Irish, and this correspondence extends in the case of several of the chief personages even to names. "Faire child" is a good translation of Finn ("the fair"); the Red Knight must be connected in some way with Aed mac Daire Dearg ("Fire, son of Daire the Red"), and Gollerotherame the giant shares the first part of his name with Goll mac Morna, about whom in Irish story the tradition of giant size especially clung.[1]

[1] The *Fiana* were all regarded as of great stature, but Goll's gigantic size was especially well known, being referred to even by writers of English. Dunbar (before 1520) speaks of "mekle Gow McMorne" as a giant (ed. Small, II [1893], 317). Gavin Douglas (before 1513) in his "Palice of Honour" has the lines:

> Greit Gowmakmorne, and Fyn Makcoul, and how
> Thay suld be goddis in Ireland, as thay say (ed. Small, I [1874], 65).

Barbour in his *Bruce* (1375) refers to "Gol mak Morn" and "Fyngal" (ed. Skeat, *STS*, Bk. III, 61). Hector Boece in his *History of Scotland* (1526) describes the giant size of "Fyn son of heaven": "Fynnanum filium coeli (Fyn mak Coul, vulgari vocabulo) virum, uti ferunt, immani statura (septenum enim cubitorum hominem fuisse narrant) Scotici sanguinis, venatoria arte insignem, omnibusque insolita corporis mole formidolosum" (ed 1575, p. 128). Keating, the seventeenth-century Irish historian, thinks it necessary to argue that Finn was not a giant (ed. Dinneen, II [1907], 330).

In post-twelfth-century development of the Finn saga, Goll as the leader of the Clann Morna became very prominent, often overtopping Finn in interest, but I find no mention of Goll mac Morna before the twelfth century. I conjecture that Goll ("blind" or "one-eyed") was at first not a proper name, but a common epithet for any one-eyed giant, or Fomorian. A good many giants named Goll figure in Middle-Irish literature; in the twelfth-century prose *Dindshenchas* (*Rev. Celt.*, XV, 323) "Goll glass" is a giant who has a giantess daughter named "Gabal"; in the "Violent Deaths of Goll and Garb" (*Rev. Celt.*, XIV, 405 f., from *LL*) Cuchulinn slew a giant named Goll who had one huge eye projecting from his head and another eye strangely sunken; Goll and Irgoll were chieftains of the Fomorians in *Cath Maige Tured* (§ 128, *Rev. Celt.*, XII, 97). Another giant named Goll is referred to in Wood-Martin, *Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland*, I, 351–52. In "Laegaire's Visit to Fairy Land" (ed. Cross, *Modern Philology*, XIII, 156–62) a redoubtable adversary, Goll mac Duilb, who was probably a giant, was at war with the fairy folk, and was slain by Laegaire, who thus freed Mag Mell from

In the entire absence of any other explanation for the facts observed the natural conclusion is that *Sp* and *M* go back, probably through several removes, to a common original *X*. The sequence of events in *Sp* and *M* is essentially the same. Both begin with the *enfances* formula and both contain an incident of the "Finn and the Goblin" type.

It may be well to consider how far *M* belongs to the "Finn and the Goblin" type—that is, how far the "Goblin" episode figures in *M*. This is desirable both because the type has not before been studied, and because the episode is altered in *M* in such a way that it might escape a hasty observer. The alteration consists in the fact that the "goblin," instead of molesting a feast, or burning a royal city, has repeatedly slain a man of Ireland.

The parallelism between this part of *M* and the episode of "Goblin" (*A*) in the *Acallam* may be summed up as follows: In both *M* and *A*, a goblin foe has injured Finn's friends on successive Hallowe'ens. (In *M*, Aed has slain several men of Ireland; in *A*, Aillén has burnt Tara.) In both *M* and *A*, Finn gets advice and a spear from Fiacail. In both *M* and *A*, Finn kills the goblin on Hallowe'en with Fiacail's spear just as the uncanny foe is entering his fairy-knoll. In both *M* and *A* the goblin is lamented by the fairy folk. It is not told in *M* who voiced this lament; in *A* it was uttered by the mother. Aed's patronymic "mac Fidga" in *M* seems a mere distortion of Aillén "mac Midhna" in *A*. One of the oldest MSS of *A* calls him once "Faillén mac Fidhgha."[1] Aed, which means "fire," is easily explained as another epithet for the fire-goblin Aillén. Ninth-century tales about Finn mention a supernatural

---

oppression. The situation is like the war between the Tuatha Dé Danaan and the Fomorians in *Cath Maige Tured*.

Gaelic ballads relate battles between Finn and one-eyed monsters. See J. F. Campbell, *Leabhar na Feinne* (1872), pp. 59 f., and especially the story of Finn's killing an enchanter named Roc who had but one hand, one foot, and one eye, at Ess Ruadh, p. 63. The Lays and Middle-Irish tales call Goll "na Beumanan" (Goll of the blows). This epithet is regularly applied to Balor, the well-known one-eyed leader of the Fomorians, "Balar Beimann" (Larminie, *West Irish Folk-Tales* [1893], p. 1; Curtin, *Hero-Tales* [1894], p. 296), which suggests that at least in later tales Goll and Balor are confused. Finn's goblin foe perhaps grew out of tales about Fomorians like Balor who were adversaries of the Tuatha Dé Danaan. Any one of these might have been named Goll, and have been the original of Gollerotherame.

[1] Rawlinson B. 487, folio 21*a*, quoted by Stokes, *Acallam*, p. 287.

foe called Aed.[1] The parallels pointed out between *M* and *A* find an echo throughout in *Sp*.

Both *M* and a part of *Sp*, therefore, belong to the "Finn and the Goblin" type. *X*, the hypothetical source of *M* and *Sp*, must also have contained the "Goblin" episode, doubtless in a form more like the older folk-tales in which the goblin troubled a feast. We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that *M* and *Sp* rest upon a common original *X*, which was doubtless a folk-tale[2] about a combat between demi-gods and giants, carried on by means of talismanic weapons. The main part of the thread of *X* is preserved in *M*, but it has been rigorously euhemerized, and owes its preservation to the fact that it was regarded as history, and was attached to the historical or pseudo-historical Finn saga.

The evidence of *M* proves that the central episode in *Sp* originally belonged to the "Finn and the Goblin" type of story, and *M* gives us a fair idea of what *X*, the source of *Sp*, was like.

XIII

It must not be forgotten that *M* and *Sp* have both been rationalized, although in different ways. *M* keeps the formula of *X* better than *Sp*. On the other hand *Sp* retains better the supernatural machinery. The author of *M* appears to have had an aversion to the marvelous, which he has carefully eliminated, doubtless because he wished his heroic saga to be connected with the annals of Ireland. He retained, however, Finn's encounter with the fairies at a *síd* (21 f.), no doubt because it did not strike Irish hearers as unhistorical.

The author of *Sp*, which was frankly a romance, had no objection to the supernatural as such, as witness his use of the Red Knight's magic armor, of the ring that rendered the wearer invulnerable, and of the witch mother who could restore her son to life. The

[1] See *Rev. Celt.*, XIII, 17 f.

[2] Panzer's "Bärensohn" formula (*Studien zur Germ. Sagengeschichte*, 1910, I) resembles *Sp* more than it does *Béowulf*, for *Béowulf* contains nothing corresponding to the hero's rescue of a princess from an other-world land and his subsequent marriage to her, which is a part of the formula, and which is in *Sp*. Panzer builds up his formula out of more than two hundred folk-tales so widely separated in place and time from each other and from the home of the *Béowulf* poem that his book merely demonstrates a probability (cf. von Sidow, *ZFDA*, LIII (1911), 123–31) that *Béowulf* has a basis in *märchen*. Panzer's book could be used to establish with at least equal probability a *märchen* background for *Sp*.

rationalization that has affected *Sp* is rather an unconscious process occasioned by the inability of the narrator, perhaps of a series of narrators, to conceive the incidents as other than a part of the chivalric life of the age and of the people for whom he told his romance. Examples of this process are seen in his calling the battle in which the elder Perceval was killed a tournament; in his making King Arthur dub Perceval knight; and in his picturing the giant Gollerotherame as a "sowdane" who fights with a sword. The tendency is that usual in earlier times and no different in principle from Garrick's playing Macbeth in powdered wig and velvet breeches. Its effect, however, is to blur the machinery of the plot.

The *Fotha Catha Cnucha*, because it is told as straight history, has been rationalized to an extreme degree. In it scarcely a trace of the original folk-tale formula is discernible.[1]

Not only are the changes wrought by rationalization important; also the structure of these two Irish pseudo-historical documents *M* and *Fotha Catha* demands a moment's consideration. *M* has, evidently, been unskilfully patched together out of two independent accounts, thus introducing two characters called "The Grey One of Luachair."[2] The first is a woman (§ 4). The second is the warrior "who dealt the first wound to Cumall in the battle of Cnucha" (§ 16). The warrior did not belong in the first of these accounts. He is not mentioned in (§ 2) along with Finn's other enemies in the battle, only an obscure phrase ("the man who kept Cumall's treasure-bag," etc.) referring to him has been inserted. In the same way two characters called Aed, both enemies to Finn, have arisen. The first Aed (the son of Daire the Red) is said to be the same as Goll mac Morna; the second Aed (the son of Fidga) is a fairy antagonist.

After the first few paragraphs Goll disappears from *M*. This first part of *M* doubtless comes from an annalistic source resembling the *Fotha Catha*, but differing from it in having no mention of Conn. The second part of *M* comes from something pretty close to a folk-tale. This source (*X*), which had some literary connection with

[1] See Nutt, *Folk and Hero Tales*, ed. MacInnes (1890), notes, pp. 399 f., and his table, p. 417.

[2] Nutt noticed this, *Folk-Lore Record*, IV (1881), 17, note.

the source of *Sp*, made Aed the chief enemy to Finn, and had little to say of Goll—that is, it was like Gilla in Chomded's poem, which does not mention Goll, although it refers to "the sons of Morna."[1]

The *Fotha Catha* is also a piecing together of independent accounts. One of them was probably the tenth-century metrical *Dindshenchas* "Almu I" (ed. Gwynn, *RIA, Todd Lecture Series*, IX (1906), 72–77, from *LL*). This knows nothing of Goll, but mentions Fiacail and Bodmall. The other source must have told of Goll.

At the risk of being tedious it is necessary to reiterate that none of the documents, not even those in Irish, are pure fairy tales. They have all been more or less rationalized by narrators who gave them a realistic setting.

XIV

What was the character of *X*, the common original of *Sp* and *M*? One or two passages which have been discussed above, where traces of a similar working up of an incident appear both in English and Irish, do not prove that *X* had developed far beyond the folk-lore stage. It was essentially a folk-tale because it preserved for the most part the original motivation. "Folk-tales do not leave the

[1] Goll seems to have taken the place of an older opponent of Finn named Aed, and perhaps the identification of Goll mac Morna and Aed mac Daire, which is made by *M* and the *Fotha Catha*, may be due to a harmonizer of different traditions. The notion that a supernatural person named Aed was one of Finn's chief antagonists is old. A ninth- or tenth-century prose tale, "Finn and the Phantoms" (see *Rev Celt.*, XIII, 17 f., and for the date *Fianaigecht*, p. xxiii), relates that Aed Rind, son of Ronan, slew a hundred of the *Fíana*, and many of their chiefs. Nobody dared to oppose this terrible foe except Finn. Cáilte finally made peace with him. Aed was received into the *Fíana*, and afterward lived by turns part of the time in his home, a fairy-knoll, and part of the time with Finn. Another Aed, a fairy chief who made presents to Finn, is mentioned in the *Acallam na Senórach*, 3640 f. (*Silva Gadelica*, II, 111). Among the graves of famous heroes is mentioned that of Aed mac Fidaig in a tenth-century poem in *LL* (*Fianaigecht*, p. xxiii). These Aeds are different personages but there can be little doubt that they were a good deal confused in the various tales, and they may hark back to a mythologica Aed who was a giant and a demi-god.

In support of the hypothesis that Goll displaced an older Aed it may be remarked that, according to the ancient tale just outlined, Aed Rind was at first a [fairy] adversary who was later received into Finn's band. This is not unlike the story of Goll, who at first a foe became a companion to Finn. In *LL*, 204*a*, 32 (cf. *RIA facsimile*, introd., p. 54), is a poem ascribed to Finn about the exploits of Goll mac Morna: "'Give me my harp' cries the hero [Goll] 'that I may play it—grand the strain—that I may put the host to sleep.' So we were all put to sleep by the yellow-haired son of Morna. When sleep had overpowered us the foe [Goll] leapt on us and we were only awakened by the death shouts of the *Fíana*." Goll is here a foe who, after enchanting Finn's men with music, slays them, much as Aed, and Aillén did in the stories above related. My conjecture is that Goll mac Morna has developed out of an older Fomorian or one-eyed monster. The explanation that Goll was a sobriquet given to Aed after he had lost an eye by the spear of Luchet reads like a bit of rationalization. Cf. Schofield, *Mythical Bards* (1920), pp. 317, 352.

point of the story in the dark. Their hearers object to puzzles."[1] As far as the *enfances* framework is concerned, *X* closely resembled *M*, the main difference being that *M* omits supernatural features, most of which have left traces in *Sp*. It is for this reason that *Sp* cannot come from *M*, and since *M* is too old to come from *Sp*, both must go back to a common source, *X*. As for the "Finn and the Goblin" episode, *X* must have been like the older Irish tales in representing the "goblin" as troubling a feast (as in *Sp*) rather than as slaying a man as in *M*, or burning a city as in *A*. Some reasons for these conclusions are as follows.

M explains why the hero's name was kept secret, a point that needs clearing up in *Sp* and in all the related stories, but is never elsewhere adequately motivated.[2] In *M* the foster-mother's chief desire was to keep Finn's name and whereabouts from the knowledge of the sons of Morna and especially from Goll, his father's foe, because they were watching to kill him. The point is made abundantly clear.[3] A comparison with *M* enables us to comprehend why, in *Sp*, Perceval is ignorant of his name. His mother had kept it secret for fear of the Red Knight, that uncanny foe who had slain the father, and was, doubtless, on the watch to kill the son. We also understand the namelessness of Perceval in Chrétien's romance and in all related stories. Chrétien appears to be puzzled by the idea,[4] for he does not set it forth at all clearly. This explanation for

[1] Quoted from Professor Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight*, p. 249.

[2] *Lanzelet*, which in the *enfances* portion has suffered less from rationalization than any other cognate tale outside of Celtic story, comes as usual closest to the real point here. The *merminne* told Lanzelet that he should not know his name until the day that he should slay the terrible Iweret.

[3] The women warriors "carry away the boy, for his mother durst not let him be with her." "The boy was secretly reared. That was indeed necessary for . . . . the sons of Morna were lying in wait" (§ 4). That was why his mother visited him secretly. "She was afraid of the sons of Morna for him" (§ 5). He fled "from the sons of Morna" (§ 7). The women warriors told him to leave them because "the sons of Morna are watching to kill thee" (§ 12). That was why he did not reveal his name to the King of Bantry (§ 13); or to the King of Kerry (§ 14). That was why he went to learn poetry "for fear of the son of Urgriu and of the sons of Morna" (§ 17).

[4] Ed. Baist, *Li Contes del Graal*, vv. 340 f., 3535 f. Bl (*Bliocadrans' Prologue*), ed. Polvin, 739–42, says that when the boy was baptized, his name was so called that it was never known, or announced, or perceived:

"Ses noms fu issi apielés
Com s'il, onques ne fust véus
Ne nonciés, ne apiercéus." 740.

(Ms. Add. 36, 614, reads "séus" Miss Weston, *Sir Perc.*, I, 71, note).

In fact the lad's name is never given in this *Prologue*. This is one of the marks of a hero brought up by a *fée*. He is nameless till he accomplishes his adventure. Cf. *Parzival*

the namelessness of the hero was in *X*, since in all the romances that may be supposed to derive from *X* this namelessness appears without apparent reason. In the romances the original motivation has dropped out because their authors did not understand (what would be clear to any Celt) that the plot involved a struggle between two clans.

The Red Knight's yearly theft of King Arthur's golden cup, which is never adequately motivated or explained in *Sp*, or Chrétien, or any of the related romances, can be understood by a comparison of the "Goblin" episode in *M* and other Irish stories. To Irish hearers, familiar with fairy lore, the conduct of the "goblin" was no puzzle. The king was under a spell or enchantment cast by the "goblin," the sign of which was that every night or every year the fairy molested his feast, just as according to modern Irish peasant belief cows when under enchantment are supposed to be visited by the fairies nightly, or at stated intervals. This explanation, which is clear enough in *M*, must have been in the source *X*. *X* was, then, practically a folk-tale and the main thread of its plot is well preserved in *M*.

XV

Was *X* Irish? The purpose of this investigation is to try to restore the folk-tale source of *Sp*, and thus to unravel the original motivation, which will appear plainer (if our hypothesis of popular origin be correct) the closer we get to the folk-tale. For our immediate purpose it matters little among what people the story arose, so long as we can grasp the point of it. The discussion, however, has made clear that *X* resembles a set of Irish tales (especially *M*) which are older than the rise of French Arthurian romance. In the complete absence of any other tales of like antiquity that closely resemble *Sp* the conclusion is almost inevitable that *X* was Irish. *M* contains the *enfances féeriques* formula and this formula, therefore, appears to have been worked out by the Irish long before it can be pointed out anywhere else in the west of Europe.

(ed. Martin, 113, 4), *Li Biaus Desconeüs*, *Libeaus Desconus*, *Enfances Gauvain* (*Romania*, XXXIX [1910], 1 f.), and *De Ortu Waluuanii* (ed. Bruce, *Hesperia* [1913], pp. 59, 92). In *De Ortu* the hero is called "puer sine nomine."

Any lingering skepticism about the antiquity of the *enfances féeriques* formula in Irish[1] must be dispelled by the existence of an older example, which is contained in two texts: the *Macgnímrada Conculaind* and the *Tochmarc Emire*, concerning the great antiquity of which there is no doubt in anybody's mind.

The *Macgnímrada Conculaind*, or "The Youthful Deeds of Cuchulinn," is a part of the *Táin Bó Cualnge*, and belongs substantially in its present form to the eighth century.[2] We here read that Cuchulinn was brought up at a distance from the king's court, although not by *fées*, and went thither as a boy. Like Perceval, Cuchulinn was a nephew to the king (Conchobor), but the latter had no knowledge of him, and inquired the boy's name. Like Finn and Perceval, Cuchulinn was swift enough of foot to run down deer, and he shot water birds (swans). Like Finn he killed some of the boy troop with whom he played. Like Finn he did not get the name by which he is generally known till he had accomplished a great exploit. He slew the dog of Culann the Smith, and because he offered to take the dog's place as watcher he became known as the Dog of Culann, "Cu-chulinn."

Cuchulinn, according to the *Macgnímrada*, was trained at first in the house of his father Sualtam,[3] but, like Finn and Perceval, he went later to be taught by fairy women. This part of his youthful adventures is not told in the *Macgnímrada*, but forms a part of another text, the *Tochmarc Emire*.[4] When Cuchulinn was six years old (according to *LU*), and had done a number of exploits, he set out to secure training in arms. He accomplished a dreadful

[1] *Enfances féeriques* are ascribed to Dermot ("He studied with Manannán mac Lir, and was brought up by him in the 'Land of Promise.' He was taught by Angus mac Oc, son of the Dagda," *Silva Gadelica*, I, 266; II, 300), but the story of Dermot's youth does not, so far as I know, exist.

[2] J. Dunn, *Táin Bó Cualnge* (1914), p. xvii; Faraday, *The Cattle-Raid of Cualnge* (1904), p. xvi. The Irish text summarized above is in Windisch, *Irische Texte*, extraband (1905), pp. 106–171.

[3] This story of Cuchulinn's education at the house of his father Sualtam is probably not primitive, although far older than the twelfth century. Cf. Kuno Meyer, *Miscellanea hibernica* (University of Illinois Studies, 1916), pp. 9 ff.; T. P. Cross, *Modern Philology*, XVI (1918), 219 f. According to the oldest stories, Cuchulinn was not the son of Sualtam but of the demi-god Lug; see Nutt, *Voyage of Bran*, II, 43 f.

[4] A shorter version of the *Tochmarc Emire* (in MS Rawlinson B512), which contains all the points here summarized, is thought by Meyer to date from the eighth century, *Rev. Celt.*, XI, 439. A longer version (from *LU* and later MSS) has been translated by Meyer, *Archaeological Review*, I. No use is here made of any point peculiar to this later version except the statement that Cuchulinn was but six years old, which occurs in *LU;* see Faraday, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

journey across the Plain of Ill Luck to reach the land of Scathach (The Shadowy), compelled her to give him instruction in arms, to become his mistress, and to foretell to him the future. In winning Scathach he was helped by her daughter Uathach (The Terrible), who fell in love with him. Before winning Scathach he slew a champion named Chocur Crufe, whose place he took. He later fought in battle on behalf of Scathach against another supernatural queen named Aife, and won a victory.

This story from the *Tochmarc Emire* is plainly a folk-tale that has been arranged to fit into the artificial heroic saga of Cuchulinn. It, taken together with the *Macgnímrada*, demonstrates the existence in Ireland, more than three hundred years before the rise of French and English romance, of a folk-tale about a hero who had a youth parallel in several points to that of Finn and Perceval, and who like them was trained in feats of arms by two women of the Other World.[1]

Since the antiquity in Irish of the *enfances féeriques* formula is beyond dispute; since *M*, the closest parallel to *Sp* that we have been able to point out, is Irish, and is evidently too old to be influenced by Arthurian romance, it seems impossible to avoid concluding that *X*, the common original of *Sp* and *M*, was Irish.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

(To be continued)

[1] Whether the folk-tale from which sprang this episode in *Tochmarc Emire* belonged to the fairy mistress type or not is of no consequence to the argument. We are concerned only with the fact that Cuchulinn as a youth visited the Other World and was there trained by supernatural women, which is sufficiently obvious in *Tochmarc Emire* as it stands. Professor Ogle's failure to see in Scathach a fairy mistress (*Amer. Jour. of Philology*, XXXVII [1916], 403 f.), therefore, does not matter here. His objection, however, makes it worth while to say very explicitly that neither *Tochmarc Emire* in this episode, nor *M*, nor *Sp*, nor (e.g.) Chrétien's *Ivain*, is a fairy mistress story as it stands. Nobody ever thought so. My point was, and is, that nobody can understand or explain any one of them except by restoring a more original folk-tale form in which it was a fairy mistress story. Why keep repeating "Laudine ist keine fée"? (Foerster, *Yvain* [1906], pp. xlvii *et al.*) In the entire absence of any evidence to the contrary I see in Scathach and her "daughter" Uathach (Do not let us take the relationship of fairies seriously!) the usual pair of supernatural women, like Lunet and Laudine (*Ivain*), the *merminne* and Iblis (*Lanzelet*), Blancemal and Blances Mains (*Li Biaus Desconeüs*), the sisters in *La Mule sanz Frain*, the sisters Lí Ban and Fand in *Serglige Conculaind* (and, as the argument tends to prove, Acheflour and Lufamour in *Sp*), who control the hero's destiny. That both Scathach and Uathach (and Aife as well) were mistresses to Cuchulinn shocks literal-minded people who do not comprehend that these creatures were *fées*. Be it remembered that Lanzelet was accused of having the *merminne* as a mistress (*Diu Crône*, 24517 f.). Uathach plays the part of Lunet because she meets the hero first, helps him and tells him how to win Scathach. Both in this episode from *Tochmarc Emire* and in *M* an original fairy story has been obfuscated in adapting it to the supposedly historical figures of Cuchulinn and Finn. The element of fairy control has been pretty thoroughly obscured, doubtless because it did not accord with the spirit of heroic saga, which tended to exalt the hero's hardihood.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace. By William Henry Schofield. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, Vol. V.) Pp. xii+381.

Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace, by the late Professor William Henry Schofield, of Harvard University, is the outcome of studies designed to lay the foundation for a *History of English Literature from Chaucer to Elizabeth*, which the author planned as a continuation of his *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer.*

Professor Schofield's book deals primarily with the problem of Blind Harry and the well-known fifteenth-century *Life of William Wallace*, so long attributed to him. After reviewing previous critical opinion, the author states his general conclusions as follows:

> I assume that the author of the *Wallace* was called Blind Harry; but I believe that he was not a minstrel at all in the ordinary acceptation of the term, and that he was never blind. I venture to hold that Blind Harry was only the author's pseudonym, and I shall try to establish the existence in myth and show the nature of the strange personage who has always been treated as the author of the work [pp. 12 f.].

While accepting John Major's evidence that at the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century the *Wallace* was attributed to a poet called Blind Harry, Professor Schofield believes that the name Blind Harry—like Blind Homer, Blind Tiresias, and Blind Ossian—is the work of traditional mythopoeic imagination. In an interlude written by Dunbar about 1500 a dwarf calls himself "Blynd Hary, That lang has bene in the Fary, Farleis to fynd," and asserts that he is descended from the Ossianic heroes Fyn Mac Kowle and Gow Mackmorne—facts which, taken in connection with a large body of evidence from popular tradition, indicate to Professor Schofield that by the beginning of the sixteenth century the Wallace-poet was regarded as a seer who, like Ossian, Thomas Rhymer, and other mythical personages, had derived supernatural knowledge from a sojourn in the other world and who had been punished with blindness for some breach of supernatural law.

"To all intents and purposes the *Wallace* is an anonymous book" (p. 116). A study of the content of the poem shows that the author, far from being an itinerant bard *a nativitate luminibus captus . . . . qui historiarum recitatione coram principibus victum et vestitum quo dignus erat nactus est* (cf. *Mythical Bards*, p. 291, note), was a clever, self-conscious artist who was fond

of imitating Chaucer and who aimed at literary display (p. 126). In order to induce his readers the more willingly to accept the fictions in which he clothes the figure of William Wallace, he uses devices which suggest those adopted by the author of *Sir John Mandeville's Travels* and "that arch-impostor of the Middle Ages, Geoffrey of Monmouth . . . . who with similar humility asserted his reliance solely on a mysterious book which he alone was privileged to possess, and with similar anxiety protested the sooth-fastness of his account, though it might not tally wholly with the information obtainable from other sources" (p. 118). Writing about 1483, when Scottish indignation against England ran high, the Wallace-poet was intent upon fomenting strife, and to this end he chose as his theme the exploits of a national hero who had valiantly opposed the Southron and, as a mouthpiece, a bard who, like Ossian and Billie Blin, alias Odin, had loved enmity and discord (p. 160). He was neither a quiet scholar nor an amicable, chivalric ecclesiastic, like Barbour, with whom he has been compared, but "a vigorous propagandist, a ferocious *realpolitiker*, without principle when it was a question of Scotland's place in the sun, without reluctance to lie in manipulating history to his own end" (p. 146). The worthy French clerk, "Master Blair," whose "Latin book" the poet explicitly mentions as his principal authority, is comparable to Chaucer's Lollius, and may be an echo of Master Blaise, the fictitious recorder of the deeds of Merlin (p. 176). Professor Schofield's book deserves well of the republic of letters for having dispelled once for all the fog of guesswork and pseudo-scholarship by which the real *Wallace* has so long been hidden.

But *Mythical Bards* is far more than a careful study of an oft-misinterpreted Middle Scots poem. The author brings a large number of Celtic and Scandinavian documents to bear on the solution of problems in early Scottish literature, and his conclusions point the way to much-needed investigations in this field (cf. p. 163). The vexed Homeric problem appears less complicated when viewed in connection with the fabled writer of the *Wallace* and with other "blind" poets. By collecting a large amount of material dealing with primitive conceptions regarding the source of poetic inspiration, the author throws a flood of light on early attempts to solve the riddle of genius and on ancient critical theories of its origin and scope.[1] In general, *Mythical Bards* is marked by the broad scholarship and the keen vision of literary problems which have always been the chief characteristics of the author's work.

By Professor Schofield's death scholarship has suffered an irreparable loss. Few teachers have ever presented the literary treasures of the Middle

[1] How much early assertions regarding Homer and the bards, scalds, and minstrels of the Middle Ages influenced conceptions of "original genius" and "nature poetry" during the Romantic period, the writer of this review hopes to show at an early date. Professor Schofield's study forms an indispensable background for the study of this and other important problems in Romanticism.

Ages in a fashion more likely to catch the ear of the modern world. Yet, in spite of the growing tendency in education to discredit the value of research, Professor Schofield never lost sight of the high and holy aim of learning. The inspiration of his work has been felt by men who never sat under his instruction. By those who have studied under him he will ever be remembered as a stimulating teacher and a genuinely disinterested and sympathetic friend.

T. P. CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Old and New, Sundry Papers. By C. H. GRANDGENT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. Pp. 177.

Old and New, Sundry Papers, is the title of a volume containing eight essays and addresses by Professor C. H. Grandgent, of Harvard University. Though covering a rather wide range of subjects, the papers included "have this in common, that they treat, in general, of changes in fashion, especially in matters of speech and of school" (Preface).

"Fashion and the Broad A," "The Dog's Letter," and "New England Pronunciation" are scholarly yet delightful essays on subjects which should interest every student of language. If there were more philologists like Professor Grandgent, Mr. H. L. Mencken would have less occasion to complain that American college professors investigate forgotten dialects to the neglect of living English. In "Numeric Reform in Nescioubia" the author by the use of a parable seeks to convince a recalcitrant and osteocephalic generation that the current mode of spelling should be changed for one less hampered by tradition. In "School" and in the address on the teaching of modern languages he demonstrates with irresistible logic that the shortcomings of modern education are largely attributable to inadequately trained teachers, lax standards of instruction, "easy" substitutes for the old humanistic curriculum, and other features of the new "democratic" movement.

"Nor Yet the New" should be read in connection with "The Dark Ages," which was listened to with such keen pleasure by the members of the Modern Language Association a few years ago. In these two papers Professor Grandgent points out how much the Modernists have lost by attempting to cut themselves off from the past. In pictorial and literary art, in education, and even in morality "the insurgent attitude has now become a pose." Professor Grandgent believes that the whole Modernist educational propaganda "is based on the false assumption that knowledge can be acquired without painfully conscious effort, if we but pick out alluring kinds of knowledge," and that its greatest danger "lies in its coincidence with the innate laziness of man." With honest seekers after truth in the field of

educational method, Professor Grandgent has no quarrel; he is striving against those who listen with credulity to the honeyed whispers or cacophonous blather of monohippic pedagogical theorists and who in their spiritual blindness follow the leadership of educational demagogues.

Professor Grandgent is no mere theorist. His conclusions are based on a long and successful career as a scholar, a teacher, and a school administrator. All who love wisdom and sound doctrine should read his words with attention; and they should ponder them in their hearts, for, in the language of Professor Grandgent's favorite poet, *non fa scienza, senza lo ritenere, avere inteso*. If it be true, as Holy Writ asserts, that the wise "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament," those who are willing to profit by Professor Grandgent's observations have an assured place in the galaxy of the future.

T. P. CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

6 V 1

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *September 1920* NUMBER 5

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHAPEL ROYAL

An institution to which some attention has been paid, and which deserves more, is the Chapel Royal. It deserves attention because in its most famous years, during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, it played a considerable part in the development of English music and drama. Upon the dramatic side, besides countless animadversions in histories of the theater, it has been treated extensively by Professor C. W. Wallace in his *Evolution of the English Drama*[1] and *Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*,[2] and by Mrs. C. C. Stopes in her *William Hunnis and the Revels of the Chapel Royal*.[3] But even before these scholars began sifting vast piles of Elizabethan documents for new evidence, the names of William Cornish, Richard Edwards, William Hunnis, and Nathaniel Gyles were of recognized importance, and a great deal of curiosity had been displayed regarding the boys who as the "Children of the Chapel" played in the hallowed Blackfriars Theater and aroused the wrath of Shakespeare. On the musical side much less has been done, and yet there are the names of Abyngdon, Cornish, Newark, Tallis, Byrd, Farrant, and Gibbons, among others, to whet curiosity. It is in that respect that the Chapel deserves more attention.

The present article, however, attempts to treat the Chapel neither from the dramatic nor from the musical point of view. Instead I have taken for my point of departure the most important

[1] Berlin, 1912.

[2] University of Nebraska Studies, 1908.

[3] Vol. XXIX of Bang's *Materialien* series, 1910.

work on the general history of the Chapel which has yet appeared, namely, Rimbault's edition of the *Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal*,[1] and have attempted to fill in some of the lacunae. Rimbault's survey of the history and constitution of the Chapel before the period covered by the *Cheque Book* is merely a sketch, to which I have been able to add many details. And especially he seems not to have known that in the Bodleian is a manuscript register duplicating the *Cheque Book* in the main, but varying from it in many particulars and richer by important entries after 1600. This document should be known to all students whose work touches upon the Chapel Royal. I feel, accordingly, that its publication is the most important function of the present article, and that the historical survey is to be regarded as a prefatory note.

1. THE CHAPEL BEFORE EDWARD

Prior to the time of Edward IV notices of the constitution and regulation of the Chapel Royal are scattering and thin. The earliest particulars date from the reign of Henry I (1100–1135), and are meager enough. They are contained in the *Liber Rubeus Scacarii*, where they form part of a table of household regulations headed *Haec est constitutio Domus Regis de procurationibus*.[2] There were two gentlemen, four servants, and two sumpter-horses, whoever and whatever else there may have been.

The ordinances of Edward III concerning his Chapel are vague; all we can discover is that there were a dean and five clerks.[3] The

[1] Printed by the Camden Society, new series, No. 3.

[2] The *Liber Rubeus* has been edited by Hubert Hall and published as No. 99 of the "Rolls Series." The section dealing with the Chapel is found on p. 807 of Vol. III. The same constitutions of the royal household form a part of the *Liber Niger Scacarii*, which has been reprinted by Thomas Hearne, Oxford, 1728. Cf. Hall's Introduction, Vol. III, p. cclxxxviii, where he points out that whereas the document in the *Black Book* had been previously dated Henry II, its proper date is Henry I, *ca.* 1135, as the *Red Book* shows.

The section of the *Liber Rubeus* relating to the Chapel runs as follows:

Capellanus Custos Capellae et Reliquiarum Conridium duorum hominum; et iiij servientes Capellae, unusquisque duplicem cibum; et duo sumarii Capellae, unusquisque denarium in die; et j*d.* ad ferrandum in mense. Ad servitium Capellae, duos cereos die Mercurii et ij die Sabbati; et unaquaque nocte j cereum coram reliquiis; et xxx frustra candelarum; et j galonem de vino claro ad missam; et unum sextarium de vino expensabili die Absolutionis, ad lavandum altare. In die Paschae ad communionem j sextarium de vino claro et j de expensabili.

Clericus expensae panis et vini, ij*s* in die, et siminellum sal[atum], et j sextarium vini expensabilis, et j cereolum, et xxiiij frustra candelarum.

[3] *A Collection of Ordinance and Regulation for the Government of the Royal Household, &c.* Printed for the Society of Antiquaries, John Nichols, London, 1790, p. *10.

ordinances of 33 Henry VI give us clearly the membership of the Chapel at that time: "1 Deane, 20 Chapeleins and Clerks, 7 Childryn, 1 Chaplain Confessor for the Householde, 1 Yoman."[1] Within the year, however, the number of the children was increased to ten, for in 1456 (34 Henry VI) forty marks were granted to Henry Abyngdon for the instruction and governance of ten boys of the Chapel of the Household.[2]

To these familiar but meager facts concerning the Chapel before Edward IV, I am able to add a few items which have hitherto escaped notice. In the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, under date of April 18, 1414, is an acquittance to Richard Prentys, late dean of the Chapel, of responsibility for the equipment thereof, excepting certain articles which are granted as gifts to various chapels and persons; and this list of exceptions, covering nearly two pages of fine type, bears witness to an opulent establishment. From the first year of Henry VI (1423) comes the first mention of the Children of the Chapel which involves anything more than a bare enumeration. It forms part of the proceedings of the Privy Council for June 15, 1423:

Thys ben ye nessessary thynges yt be rythe nedful for ye schyldern of ye schapel, of ye wych ye namys be,

Thomas Myldevale
John Brampton
John Maydeston
John Grymmesby
Nicolas Hyll
Stephanus Howell

In primis every schyld j. gowne & j. hode & j. doubelat & ij. payre of linnen clothys and ij payr of hosyn and iij payr of schon.

In bedyng ij. schylder j. contour & testour & i. payr blankets & ij. payr schetys & j. paylet & j. canvas.|

Littera inde fuit facta apud Westmonasterium xxiij.o die Junij anno &c primo.[3]

Not without interest, also, is a petition of the clerks of the Chapel, made to the Privy Council on August 6, 1455 (33 Henry VI), to consider "the grete labour that thei have daily in your chapell

[1] *Ibid.*, p. *17.

[2] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 1452–61, p. 279.

[3] *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England* (edited by Sir Harris Nicolas, London, 1834), III, 104.

bicause the numbre of hir feliship is lasse that it was woned to be, and for to ordeyne such a numbre as they may endure and doo better service to God and to your highnesse, and that this numbre may be at the least xxiiij. synging men."[1]

By this time a method of recruiting for the Chapel had been put in use which was to continue in favor for two centuries—namely, that of impressing from the choirs of other churches. I am not aware how old this seemingly high-handed practice was. It was an expedient frequently used, as every student knows, not only for filling the ranks of the Chapel Royal, but also for obtaining men of almost any kind—artificers,[2] mechanics, musicians, etc.—to do work for the crown. The earliest writ of this kind for the Chapel that I have been able to find was granted in 1420, when John Pyamour, clerk, was authorized to take up as many boys as were needed for the Chapel wherever he could find them and to bring them to the king, who was then in the duchy of Normandy.[3] The oft-printed grant to John Melyonek of September 16, 1484,[4] which authorized him to take up "al suche singing men & childre being expart in the said science of Musique as he can finde and think sufficient and able to do vs seruice," is noteworthy in that it directs the impressment of men as well as boys. The writs of later date were confined to children. How they came to be abused forms one of the most interesting chapters in the dramatic history of the Chapel.

In order that the depredations of the master of the Chapel might not injure certain other favored choirs, such as those of St. Paul's and the royal chapels at Westminster and Windsor, exemptions were frequently granted these institutions. The earliest of these that has come to my hand is dated July 9, 1453, when, at the request of Thomas Lyseux, dean of St. Paul's, protection was granted for all choristers and ministers of the said church, with the assurance that neither the dean of the king's Chapel nor any other officer or

[1] *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England* (edited by Sir Harris Nicholas, London, 1834), VI, 256.

[2] Cf. the patent to John de Sponlee in 1350 to impress masons and artificers for work on the new Chapel of St. George, Windsor, and to arrest and imprison such as disobeyed. *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 1348–50, p. 488.

[3] *Patent Rolls*, 7 Henry V, memb. 11d, January 14.

[4] See Rimbault, *Old Cheque Book*, p. vii; Collier, *History of the English Drama* (1879), I, 41, among others.

minister of the king should take any such chorister or minister for the use and service of the king or other against his will.[1]

2. THE CHAPEL UNDER EDWARD IV

The first full and satisfactory description of the Chapel Royal dates from the reign of Edward IV, and is contained in the *Liber Niger Domus Regis*.[2] There were twenty-six chaplains and clerks, appointed by the king or the dean, "men of worship endowed with vertuous morall and speculatife as of their musique showing in discant, cleare voysid weele releesid and pronounceing, eloquent in redyng, suffisaunt in Organes playing, and modestiall in all othir manner of behaveing." They lodged together at or near the court, and had, each of them, "for winter and summer cloathing of the grete warderobe of housold fortie shillings." The yeomen of the Chapel, called also "pistelers," were two in number. They were usually appointed from Children of the Chapel when their voices changed. They received each a daily stipend of 3*d.* and clothing from the Wardrobe such as the rest of the Household wore—"playn and noe partie"; or as an alternative they were allowed by special dispensation to draw a yearly wage of 53*s.* 4*d.* The children were eight in number, and were supplied in all things pertaining to their apparel from the Jewelhouse. They were under the supervision of the master of song, chosen by the dean from among the gentlemen of the Chapel; "and he to drawe theise childryn aswell in the schoole of facett, as in songe organes or such othir vertuys." They sat at the Chapel board next the yeomen of the Vestry, and had for livery two loaves, a mess of "grete mete," and two gallons of ale. They had one servant among them "to trusse and bere thair harnys and to sett thair Livereys in Court." And when they went about with the court on one of its removings, they each had 4*d.* for horse hire. When their voices changed, if they could not be retained in the Chapel or given a place at court, they were sent to either of the universities, and there lodged in a college of the king's foundation until further advancement was devised for them.

[1] *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*, 1452–61, p. 90.

[2] This document, frequently cited, has been printed with many inaccuracies in the *Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household*, before referred to.

These provisions for the children and other members of the Chapel Royal are both generous and ample. Doubtless many of the rules were taken over from the ordinances of Edward III, to which reference is made. The most kindly of the provisions for choristers is that which assured them a competent living when they had outgrown their usefulness in the Chapel. It continued in force down to the reign of thrifty Elizabeth, when, along with many other perquisites of the Chapel, it lapsed,[1] and it was revived by James I.[2] Most of the children, however, seem not to have availed themselves of the chance to go through the university; many of them stayed on in the Chapel, which itself offered a career of distinction, or went into the chapels of other churches, or went into the court. Some lived to an old age in the Chapel.

But to return to the regulations of Edward IV. The office of dean was one "given without presentation or confirmation of any Bishop." Under his appointment was the master of grammar. This man was to be versed in poetry and the rules of grammar; his duties were to teach the king's henchmen, the Children of the Chapel "after they can their descant," the clerks of the Almonry, and such other men and children about the court as might be disposed to learn. For these services he was paid $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ a day, or 9 marks a year. At this time, apparently, the instruction of the Children of the Chapel was divided between a master of music and a master of grammar.

3. THE CHAPEL UNDER HENRY VIII

The next set of Chapel regulations we come upon dates from the seventeenth year of Henry VIII, and is contained in the same volume with the *Liber Niger*.[3] It conveys little information for our purpose because the numbers of the various members of the Chapel are not given, but instead such information as was more interesting to the officers of the household, namely, what livery they took and at what

[1] Cf. the petition of William Hunnis in 1583, below.

[2] As part of an impressment writ to Nathaniel Gyles in 1604.

[3] *Harl. MS* 642. These institutions are arranged under two different headings: the first, on fol. 129 ff., is "Statuta Regis Henrici octavi facta anno Regni sui 17o"; the second, fol. 142, "Thappointment of Lodging made by the kings grace at his Mannor of Eltham the 17th daye of Januarye in the 17th yeare of his most noble Raigne." From the second heading the regulations are generally known as the "Statutes of Eltham."

board they sat. One section of these statutes, which provides that a portion of the Chapel shall accompany the court on its peregrinations, is worth especial note, for it means that the master of the children accompanied the court not only on its progresses about England but also into France. We can trace him there at least twice: once at the time of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, in 1520, and probably again in 1544–45, when Henry was waging his last war against the French.[1] When we recollect that during the reign of Henry, and indeed until late in the century, the Chapel master was the mainspring of court revelry, deviser and composer of masques and plays, and actor in them; and when we consider how the native interludes born at court reflected the similar work of France, as in the plays of Heywood, then we may begin to speculate as to whether the French drama came to England or (as seems equally likely) the Englishmen learned it in France on just such occasions as that of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, and whether the Chapel, through its master, was not an influential factor in bringing the farce back to England.

Aside from the *Statutes of Eltham*, references to Henry VIII's Chapel are without number in the Household Books, Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, and other records of the sort. We can judge from them that the constitution of the Chapel was pretty stable by the accession of Henry, although there were variations in the number of men and boys. The gentlemen ranged in number from twenty to thirty-two and the children from eight to twelve. A puzzling feature of the various sets of figures we encounter is that the Chapel seems not to have increased steadily in size from the beginning to the end of the reign but grew and diminished without apparent reason. For example, in the first year of Henry's reign

[1] Among the list of Chapel men who are ordered to accompany Henry into France on the occasion of the Field of the Cloth of Gold (see below, p. 244) occurs the name of Cornish. That the children also went along is implied by an entry in one of the Books of King's Payments (*Excheq, Miscel., T.R.*, Vol. CCXVI, p. 201): 12 H. VIII, Aug. 1, "Item to m*aster* Cornisshe opon a warrant for the diett*es* of x Children eu*ery* of theim at ijd. the day for lxij dais at the king*es* Jo*urney* to Calais. from the xx^{ti}ix day of May unto the xxij^{ti} day of July last—Ciijs. iiijd."

The evidence of the presence of the master in France during the wars of 1544–45 is not so clear. Nevertheless the fact that the Chapel boys were there, as shown by the wardrobe accounts of Sir Ralph Sadler (see below, p. 241), is a strong implication. It is unlikely that they would be taken without their master.

(1509) there were thirty men and ten children;[1] whereas in 1553 the numbers seem to have been, respectively, twenty and eight.[2]

About March, 1518, Henry VIII told Cornish, then master of the Chapel, that Wolsey's chapel was better than his. Cornish seems to have taken measures at once, for Pace, Wolsey's confidant, wrote his master on April 1 that "Cornysche doth greatly laud and praise the child of your chapel sent hither, not only for his sure and cleanly singing, but also for his good and crafty descant, and doth in like manner extol Mr. Pygote for the teaching of him."[3] The superiority of the great churchman's chapel is attested in a letter from Pace of the preceding March:

> My lord, if it were not for the personal love that the King's highness doth bear unto your grace, surely he would have out of your chapel, not children only, but also men; for his grace hath plainly shown unto Cornysche that your grace's chapel is better than his, and proved the same by this reason, that if any manner of new song should be brought unto both the said chapels to be sung *ex improviso*, then the said song should be better and more surely handled by your chapel than by his grace's.[4]

The splendors of Wolsey's chapel were the admiration of the times; the cardinal lavished particular care on it, and enriched it with the plunder of Northumberland's famous and no less splendid chapel.[5]

A more detailed account of the Chapel is given in *The Booke of the new order of the Houshold* of Henry VIII,[6] which is to be assigned to the seventeenth year, as nearly as I can tell from the dating of the

[1] From items in a volume of Wardrobe Accounts in the Lord Chamberlain's Office (L. C. 2/1, Public Record Office). On fol. 153, among warrants issued in the first year of Henry VIII, are mentioned cloth and accessories for thirty surplices for the men, and the same for ten surplices for the boys.

[2] See Mrs. Stopes's *William Hunnis*, p. 15, where it is a question of forty surplices for the men and sixteen for the children. Here, as frequently in these records, the garments are numbered on the basis of two apiece.

[3] Brewer and Gairdner, *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, II, Part II, § 4055.

[4] *Ibid.*, § 4024.

[5] Cf. Bishop Percy's edition of *The Regulations and Establishment of the Royal Household of Henry Algernon Percy, The Fifth Earl of Northumberland*, London, 1770, p. 428. Wolsey's confiscations came after the death of this earl, on the accession of his son.

The accounts in this little volume are of great interest as showing how nearly royal were the households of the great nobles. The Northumberland chapel was smaller, to be sure, than that of Henry VIII, but it made up for lack of numbers in lavishness of furnishings, which may be read of in Bishop Percy's book. There were ten men and six children. One extract illustrates the scale of wages that singing men might expect to receive in those days. It is found on p. 47.

> Gentillmen of the Chapell x As to say Two at x marc a pece—Three at iiij^{li} apece—Two at v marc a pece—Oone at xl^{s}. Viz. ij Bassys ij Tenors and vj Countertenors Childeryn of the Chapel vj after xxv^{s} the pece.

[6] L. C. 5/12 (Public Record Office).

manuscript—the year of the *Statutes of Eltham*. On page 50, among the wages of the ordinary of the king's side, occurs the following list:

	The Deane to Eate with M*aster* Trea*surer* or M*aster* Comptroller.	
	Gent*lemen* of ye Chapell	
	M*aster* of the Children for his wag*es* . .	xxx^{li}
Chapell	And xxx Boordwag*es*	
&	Gospeller for wag*es*	xiij^{li} vj^{s} viij^{d}
Vestry	Epistoler	xiij^{li} vj^{s} viij^{d}
	Verger	xx^{li}
	Yeom*en* of the Vestry	x^{li}
	. . . . .	x^{li}
	. . . . .	x^{li}
	Children of ye Chapel x	lxvj^{li} xiij^{s} iiij^{d}

The children received no regular wage, but were given a liberal largess on high feast days, and received other fees from various sources and on various occasions. They were remembered on the birthdays of the king and of the royal family. In the matter of payments for plays, the master, no doubt, got the lion's share; but very likely a few pence were given the children for their extra labor. The largess on high feast days included payments of twenty shillings at Allhallowtide for singing *Audivi vocem*, and forty shillings at Christmas for singing *Gloria in excelsis*. These payments, with various others, brought the sum of largesses to £9–13–4.

The children were dressed from the Wardrobe, and that in no mean fashion. Among the accounts of Sir Ralph Sadler as Custodian of the Wardrobe, a^{o} 35–36 Henry VIII (1544–45), are given the expenses of Henry's voyage to France in that year, when he was waging his last war on the French:[1]

For x singinge Chyldren	Off Stoore of the greate Warderobe	sine
	xiiij yardes of skarlett kersey for hoose for the said children	*precio*
	George Bristowe for xiij yardes of yellow kersey for hoose for them also price the yarde ij^{s} iiij^{d}	xxx^{s} iiij^{d}
	of stoore ij yardes of satten crimsin for the coveringe of hatt*es* for the children sine pretio	sine *precio*
	Item of the same stoore ij yardes of yellowe satten for the same cause sine pretio	sine *precio*

[1] *Exchequer Accounts*, 443/10 (P.R.O.).

At another time this equipment was required for the use of the Chapel boys:

> For gownes of Tawney Chamblett lined with black satin of Bruges, and Milan bonettes for the said children. . . . xliij^{li} iij^{s} iiij^{d}. For two children of the King's Chapell, for 2 gownes of Black Chamblett, lined with black satin of Bruges, 2 cotes of yellow satten of Bruges lined with Coton, and 2 Milan bonnettes, and for the making and lining of said gownes and cotes as in the said boke at large it duly apperes x^{li} xviij^{s}.[1]

The children seem to have been boarded by their master; but the evidence in this regard is a little confusing, for the household ordinances, such as those contained in the *Liber Niger* and the *Statutes of Eltham*, assign to the boys a place at the court table. Yet we find such payments as this (9 Henry VIII, July 5): "Item to master Cornisshe opon a warr*ant* for the bordding of x Children of the Chapell eu*e*ry of theim at viij^{d} the weke for iij wek*es* ended the xxvijth day of Juyne—xx^{s}."[2] This looks as though the boarding was done by the master, who was reimbursed in part or in whole by the crown. It was the custom at this time for the choir-boys to lodge with their master, the cost being defrayed by a grant of money from the treasury. The patent to Newark,[3] for example, reads that he was to be paid forty marks yearly for the teaching of ten boys and for supplying them with beds and clothing.

The gentlemen of the Chapel received as their usual wage 7½*d.* a day apiece. In addition they had various fees and largesses. One regular fee of £13–6–8 fell at Christmas. Others came at other times for other reasons. On January 6, 2 Henry VIII, they were paid £6–13–4 "for praying for the quenes grace for hir goode delyueraunce."[4] Once a year the gentlemen held a feast, to which it was customary for the king to contribute. In earlier times he gave a buck, which was commuted at a later period to money for food and wine, and finally set at £3.

There is no complete record of the personnel of the Chapel before 1560, the year in which the *Cheque Book* begins; but among the various household accounts are a number of lists scattered over the

[1] Cited by Mrs. Stopes, *William Hunnis*, p. 15.

[2] *Excheq. Miscel., Treasury of Receipt*, Vol. CCXV, p. 527.

[3] In *Patent Rolls*, 9 Henry VII, memb. 31 (7); dated September 17, 1493.

[4] *Excheq. Miscel., T.R.*, Vol. CCXV, p. 100.

reigns of the two Henrys, Edward, and Mary, which serve, although incompletely, to fill in that period.[1] Some of them have been published. The earliest that I have found relates to equipment for the funeral of Elizabeth, wife of Henry VII, and therefore is dated February 23, 1504.[2] The following names of gentlemen of the Chapel are given: Edward John, William Newerk, John Sidburgh, Thomas Bladesmyth, John Penne, Henry Wilkyns, John Cornish,[3] John Prate, Robert Fairfaux, John Petwyn, Thomas Sexton, William Sturton, Robert Penne, John Fyssher, John Venner, John Fowler, William Tebbe, William Browne.

My next list is published now for the first time. It occurs in a volume of Wardrobe Accounts in the Lord Chamberlain's Office.[4] The book is undated, but the association of the names of Newark, Crane, and Cornish shows that the list belongs subsequent to the one of 1504, in which Crane's name does not appear, and previous to

[1] From the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, with some aid from other source books, certain of the more prominent officials of the Chapel can be traced back for some distance.

The following is a list of deans, so far as I could trace them, with the dates of the documents which contain their names: John de Wodeford (April 25, 1349), John de Leek (June 23, 1356), Thomas de Lynton (August 20, 1380), John Boor (January 20, 1389), Richard Kyngeston (February 6, 1400), Richard Prentys (March 10, 1403), Edmund Lacy (April 18, 1414), Robert Gilbert (May 30, 1421), Richard Praty (appointed March 1, 1432; cf. *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, Vol. IV), John Croucher (July 12, 1440), Robert Ayscogh (May 19, 1447), William Say (July 13, 1449), William Dudley (July 30, 1471), John Gunthorpe (November 10, 1481), William Chauntre (May 16, 1483), Richard Hill (1489; cf. *Cal. Inquisitions*, H. VII, Vol. II), Thomas Jane (November 7, 1496), Richard Nikke (called "late dean" on April 24, 1501), Geoffrey Simeon (January 17, 1501).

Of these men, Boor, Kyngeston, Prentys, and Lacy came in direct succession, and so did Gunthorpe and Chauntre. I am not sure of any of the others.

The succession of masters of the children is clear from John Plummer on. His grant of office took effect September 29, 1444. Following him came Henry Abyngdon (appointed March 16, 1455), Gilbert Banaster (September 29, 1478), Lawrence Squire (September, 1486), William Newark (1493), William Cornish (September, 1509), William Crane (Easter, 1523), Richard Bower (June 30, 1545). Cf. Wallace's *Evolution of the English Drama, passim.*

I have found only one reference to the master of song, who by the ordinances of Edward IV (*q.v.*) is distinguished from the master of grammar. The *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, under date of March 24, 1465, contains a grant for life to the king's servitor Robert Bunnock, for his good services in the instruction of boys in the art of music to sing in the king's chapel, of a yearly rent of 10 marks.

For other miscellaneous items connected with the personnel of the Chapel prior to Edward IV, cf. *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, 280 ff. (Manly's article on "The Chapel Royal").

[2] Printed in Henry Cart de Lafontaine's *The King's Music*, London, 1909.

[3] Is this correct? Nothing is known of a John Cornish, whereas William Cornish had been about court, presumably as member of the Chapel, since 1493.

[4] L. C. 2/1, fol. 202 *b* (Lord Chamberlain's office, P.R.O.).

November, 1509, when Newark is reported to be dead.[1] Among the ordained priests are listed: Master Doctor Atwat[er], Dean, Sir Richard Surlond, Sir Roger Norton, Sir John Kyte, Sir John Coole, Sir William Post, Sir John annes, Sir John ffouler, Gospeller. The gentlemen were: Robert ffeyrefax, William Newark, John Sudburgh, William Cornysshe, Edward John, William Broun, John Petroyn (?), William Crane, John Weyver, John penne, William Sturton, John Smythe, Roberte penne, Thomas Sexton, John ffyssher, Henry Stevynson, William Dobeney, Henry prentyce. There was an unnamed sergeant of the Vestry. The epistolers were: Robert hawkyns, John Buntyng, Nicholas hornclyff, and Geffrey Wryght, groom. The children were: William Colman, William Maxe, William Alderson, henry Merett, John Williams, Arthur lovekyn, Nicholas Joe, John Graunger, Edward Coke, henry Andrewe.

The next list, taken from an accounting of liveries for the funeral of Prince Henry in February, 1511, duplicates in the main the preceding.[2] The gentlemen were: Master Doctor Farefax, Edward John, John Lloid, John Sidborough, William Browne, William Cornysh, William Sturton, William Crane, John Pende, Thomas Sexton, John Wever, John Fissher, Robert Pende, Henry Stevenson, William Daubeney, Henry Prentisshe, Thomas Farthyng, John Gyles, Robert Hawkyns, John Petwyn, Davy Burten. The children were: William Colman, William Maxe, William Alderson, Henry Meryell, John Williams, John Graunger, Arthur Lovekyn, Henry Andrewe, Nicholas Ioy, Edward Cooke, James Curteys.

Another interesting list, unfortunately confined to the gentlemen, gives us the names of the Chapel in 1520. It is taken from a document relating to the Field of the Cloth of Gold.[3] The italicized names are those which occur in the 1509 (?) list: *Sir Roger Norton*, subdean, Sir William Tofte, *Sir John Cole*, Sir John Muldre, Sir Andrew Yong, Sir Thomas Hal, Sir William Blakenden, Sir Richard Elys, *Robert Fairefax*, John Lloyd, *John Sudborow, William Cornysh, Robert Penne, John Wever, John Fisher, William Daubney*, Thomas Farthing, *Henry Stevinson, Robert Hawkins*, Davy Burton, John

[1] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, 282.

[2] Printed also in Lafontaine's *The King's Music.*

[3] Brewer and Gairdner, *op. cit.*, III, Part I, 245.

Giles, Thomas Bury, John Tyl, *William Colman*, Thomas Cheyny, William Hogeskyn, Robert Jones, *William Crane*, Sir Robert Cotes, gospeller, Sir John Whetwood, epistoler, William Rothewel, *John Bunting*, *Nicholas Horneclif*, William Lambe, *Geoffrey Write*. When Parliament was held at Blackfriars on November 3, 1529, John Bunting sat with Richard Gibson for Rumney.

Still another list dates from February, 15 Henry VIII (1524); it forms part of the estreats of the subsidy leviable on the king's household.[1] The original I found to be in very bad condition, the names much faded. Nevertheless I deciphered the following, which are found in the 1520 list: Robert Penne, John Wever, John Fisher, William Daubney, Henry Stevinson, Robert Hawkins, Davy Burton, John Giles, Thomas Bury, John Tyl, William Coleman, William Rothewell, and William Lambe. Newcomers were: Robert Phillip, Nicholas (Woodruff?), John (Ricroft?), Richard (Horne?), Robert Walsingham, John Dale, Robert Skynner, William Pe(n?), Thomas Skelton, James Michell, Peter Dalton, John Dawson, John Grove, Henry Grove, Thomas Inglisshe, Richard Veay.

One more list from the time of Henry VIII I add because it has a double value, in that it indicates the scale of wages which obtained among the men of the Chapel in 1526 and introduces some new and interesting names:[2] "Ministers of the King's chapel, 7½*d.* a day:—Ric. Ward, Thos. Haule, Ric. Elles, ... y Dogget, Thos. Wescot, Emery Tuckfyld, Andrew Trace, Nic. Archbold, Wm. Walker, Wm. Crane, Robt. Pend [doubtless Penne], John Fisher, Hen. Stephinson, Thos. Bury, Wm. Colman, Robert Johns, Robt. Phillipps, Avery Burnett, Hugh Roodes, Thos. Byrd, Ric. Bower, Ric. Pygot, Edm. Bekham, Robt. Pury, Wm. Barbor, John Fuller, Robt. Rychmount, John Alyn, John Stephen. At 4½*d.* a day:—Simon Gyldar, gospeller, Ric. Greene, verger. At 3*d.* a day:—John Singer, epistoler, Ralph Tapping, yeoman." Richard Bower appears here for the first time; he was later the successor of Crane as master of the children. Hugh Rhodes was the author of the metrical *Book of Nurture* and the "Song of the Boy Bishop of St. Paul's." I should like to connect the name of Thomas Wescott with the more famous Sebastian Westcote

[1] *Excheq. Q.R.* 69/23 (P.R.O.).

[2] Brewer and Gairdner, *op. cit.*, IV, Part I, §1939 (p. 870).

who was for many years the master of the children of St. Paul's and the producer of their plays, but as yet I have been unable to substantiate my guess. Thomas Bird, of course, is well known in the history of music.

From other accounts during Henry's reign we glean occasional names which go to swell our lists of Chapel members. Thus we find Cornish being paid quarterly 33*s.* 4*d.* for "fynding & teaching of William Saundres late childe of the Chapell."[1] Again,[2] he is recorded as having been paid, a° 6 Henry VIII, £6–13–4 for "oone master Gyles[3] that plaid on thorgans in the kinges Chapell," and "oone Corbroude a syngyng man" is paid 66*s.* 8*d.* by the hands of Cornish. Other names we are familiar with are those of Robert Testwood and John Marbeck, both singing men, who were arraigned and condemned in relation to the Mass in 35 Henry VIII.[4] Robert White, a composer famous in his day, is supposed to have been of Henry's Chapel.[5]

4. THE CHAPEL UNDER THE LATER TUDORS AND JAMES I

By the accession of Edward VI the Chapel had pretty well crystallized in its composition, and it changed little throughout succeeding reigns. The standard which it thus maintained was thirty-two gentlemen, besides eight or nine gospellers, vergers, yeomen, etc., and twelve children. Mrs. Stopes prints a list of the gentlemen of Edward's Chapel in her book on William Hunnis.[6] At this time the master of the children was Richard Bower, who received the same fees for his services as Cornish and Crane before him—£40 wages, £9–13–4 for largess for the children at high feasts, and £16 for breakfasts for the children. The gentlemen were these: Emery Tuckfield, Nicholas Aurchbalde, William Walker, Robert Chamberleyne, John Leide, William Gravesend, John Angell, William Hutchins, Robert Philipps, Thomas Byrde, Richard Bowyer, Robert Pirrey, William Barbor, Robert Richmond, Thomas Waite,

[1] *Excheq. Miscel., T.R.*, Vol. CCXV, p. 527.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 371.

[3] The same, probably, as the John Gyles in the 1520 list.

[4] Hall's *Chronicle*, p. 858.

[5] Mrs. Stopes, *William Hunnis*, p. 17.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

Thomas Talles, Nicholas Mellowe, Thomas Wright, Robert Stone, John Benbowe, John Sheppheard, William Mauperley, George Edwards, Robert Morcocke, William Hynnes [Hunnis], Thomas Manne, Richard Aylesworth, Thomas Palfreman, Roger Kenton, Lucas Caustell, Richard Farrant, Edward Adams (these all at 7½*d.* the day); John Smith and Robert Bassocke (at 4½*d.* the day); Thomas Causton, Richard Lucam, John Denham, Walter Thirleby, and Tedder Morrison[1] (at 3*d.* the day); and Hugh Williams (at 40*s.* the year).[2]

Mrs. Stopes has also printed, in the *Athenaeum*,[3] a Chapel list from the first year of Queen Mary. It is almost identical with the one just given, except that instead of thirty-two gentlemen there are only twenty-nine, the missing names being those of John Leide, Robert Philipps, and Thomas Manne, and, instead of John Smith and Richard Lucam among the subsidiary officers, we find John Singer, "gospeler preste," and Richard Lever; but it is possible that the last two pairs of names are the same, and have been wrongly inscribed or wrongly read.

In none of these lists does the name of Richard Edwards appear; yet he entered the Chapel soon after Mary's accession, for in the roll of New Year's gifts for Philip and Mary, in 1556–57, his name is included, along with Shepherd's of the Chapel, for presenting verses.[4] Neither do we find the name of Christopher Tye, the famous organist; yet in 1553 when he published his metrical rendering of the *Acts of the Apostles*, he called himself on the title-page "gentleman of his Majesty's Chapel." As we progress farther into the century the familiar names become more numerous. Palfreyman, Tye, Tallis, Farrant, Shepherd, Bird, were men who belong to the history of music, or, as in the case of Farrant, to music and drama.

While there are no household ordinances of Queen Mary extant, to my knowledge, like those of Henry and Edward, yet it seems as though she intended to keep up the Chapel with the same liberality

[1] In the list of Mary, referred to in the next paragraph, Mrs. Stopes gives the name as Morris Tedder. I do not know which may be right.

[2] In Rimbault's *Old Cheque Book*, p. x, is a Chapel list of the time of Edward which was reprinted from Hawkins and Burney. It is identical with the list above except that John Kye appears in place of John Leide.

[3] September 9, 1905, p. 347.

[4] Mrs. Stopes, *William Hunnis*, p. 23.

that her father used. For instance, she made special provision in the first year of her reign for the transportation of the children at such times as the court removed from London.[1] But under the economical rule of Elizabeth many of the perquisites heretofore belonging to the children and their master were allowed to lapse, with what result we may judge from the pathetic appeal of William Hunnis, the master, in 1583. Although this petition has been frequently printed,[2] it is too important to omit from any history of the Chapel Royal.

Maye it please yo^{r} honores will*ia*m Hunnys M^{r} of the Children of hir highnes Chappell, most humble beseecheth to consid^{r} of these fewe lynes.

ffirst hir Ma*ies*tie alloweth for the dyett of xij children of hir sayd Chappell daylie vj^{d} a peece by the daye, and xl^{li} by the yeare for theyre apparrell and all other furneture.

Agayne there is no ffee allowed neyther for the m^{r} of the sayd childr*en* nor for his vssher, and yet neu*er*theless is he constrayned, over and besyd*es* the vssher still to kepe bothe a man s*er*vant to attend vpon them and lykewyse a woman s*er*uant to wash and kepe them cleane.

Also there is no allowance for the lodginge of the sayd Children, such tyme as they attend vppon the Courte, but the m^{r} to his greate charge is dryuen to hyer chambers both for him self, his vssher Chilldren and servantes.

Also theare is no allowaunce for ryding Jornies when occasion serueth the m^{r} to trauell or send into sundrie p*ar*tes within this Realme, to take vpp and bring such children as be thought meete to be trayned for the service of hir ma*ies*tie.

Also there is no allowaunce ne other consider*a*c*i*on for those children whose voyces be chaunged, whoe onelye do depend vpon the charge of the sayd M^{r} vntill such tyme as he may p*re*ferr the same w*i*th cloathing and other furniture, vnto his no smalle charge.

And although it may be obiected that hir Ma*iestes* allowaunce is no whitt less then hir *Maiestes* ffather of famous memorie therefore allowed: yet considering the pryces of thing*es* present to the tyme past and what annuities the m^{r} then hadd out of sundrie abbies within this Realme, besydes sondrie gift*es* from the kinge, and dyuers perticuler ffees besydes, for the better mayntenaunce of the sayd childr*en* and office: and besides also there hath ben withdrawne from the sayd chilldren synce her Ma*iestes* comming to the Crowne xij^{d} by the daye which was allowed for theyr breakefast*es* as maye apeare by the Treasorer of the Chamber his accompt, for the tyme

[1] Mrs. Stopes, *William Hunnis*, p. 252.

[2] E.g., by Wallace, *Evolution of the English Drama*, pp. 156–58, and Mrs. Stopes, *William Hunnis*, pp. 252–53. I have used Wallace's text as being literally faithful. The original is in *S. P. Dom. Eliz.*, CLXIII, No. 88. It is indorsed "1583 Novembr The humble peticion of the M^{r} of the Childr*en* of hir highnes Chappell."

beinge. with other allowaunces incident to the office as appeareth by the auntyent accomptes in the sayd office, which I heere omytt.

The burden heereof hath from tyme to tyme so hindred the M^rs of the children viz m^r Bower, m^r Edwardes, my sellf and m^r ffarant: that notwithstanding some good helpes otherwyse some of them dyed in so poore case, and so deepelie indebted that they haue not left scarcelye wherewith to burye them.

In tender consideracion whereof, might it pleaes yo^r honores that the sayde allowaunce of vj^d a daye apeece for the Childrens dyet might be reserued in hir Maiestes coffers during the tyme of theyr attendaunce. And in Liew thereof they to be allowed meate and drinke within this honorable householde for that I am not able vppon so small allowaunce eny longer to beare so heauie a burden. Or otherwyse to be consydred as shall seeme best vnto yo^r honorable wysdomes.

What success Hunnis had with his petition is not definitely known. There seems to be good reason for thinking he had none; else there had not been such great cause for rejoicing in the Chapel when in 1604 King James granted a general augmentation.[1] Moreover, the record of this grant in the *Cheque Book* declares that "the intertainement of the Chappell was not augmented of many yeares by any his Majesties progenitors." The following increases were ordered: for the gentlemen, ten pounds, making their wages forty pounds; for the children, four pence apiece per diem, making their allowance ten pence; for the sergeant of the Vestry, ten pounds; and for the yeomen and grooms of the Vestry four pence apiece per diem. How the Chapel felt about these increases may be judged from the fact that the page in the *Cheque Book* which bore the precious grant was inscribed with the anathema: "Cursed be the partie that taketh this leafe out of this booke." It was for them the most important ordinance that had been issued since the *Statutes of Eltham*.

The edict of James so reverentially recorded was not the only good turn he did the Chapel, for he revived the practice of sending the boys to the universities when their voices broke. The provisions which formulate his decisions in this regard are attached to a writ of impressment granted Nathaniel Gyles, as Chapel master, in September of 1604,[2] just a few months before the great augmentation.

[1] Cf. the *Old Cheque Book*, p. 60.

[2] *Privy Signet Bills, T.R.*, September 2, Jas. I, No. 40.

This interesting document, rarely even alluded to, has never been printed in full. I select here the part which relates to our present purpose:

And of the said Nathanaell Giles Master of the Children of our said Chappell of our princly care for the advancment helpe and furtherance of such Children as shalbe taken to serve in our said Chappell as aforesaid of our especiall grace certain knowledg and meere motion we have willed ordayned Constituted graunted and declared And by these *presentes* for us our heires and successors do will ordayne graunt and declare that when and so often as any of the Children of our said Chappell having served in the same by the space of three yeres or more shall by reason of the Chaung of his or their voice or voices become insufficient or unmeet for the service of us our heires or successors in the same Chappell that then and from tyme to tyme at all tymes it shall and may be lawfull unto the Master of the Children of our said Chappell for the tyme being by and with the discretion and allowance of the Deane of our said Chappell for the tyme being and in the vacancie of a Deane of our said Chappell, then by and with the discretion and allowance of two or more of our privy Councell to send or convey any such Child or Children so becoming insufficient or unmeet for the service of us our heires and successors in the same Chappell to any Colledg Hall or schoole being of the foundac*i*on of us or of any of our progenitors kinges or Queenes of this our realme of England or whereof we, or any of our progenitors are or have ben called and are accompted founders within any the universities of Oxford or Cambridg or in any other place or schoole whatsoever within this our Realme of England to be receaved admitted and placed in any of them in the rome and place of a scholer of the foundac*i*on of any such Colleg hall or schoole and to give pay and allowance into the said Child or Children and euery one of them to be sent as aforesaid all such wages lodging diet instruction teaching and other allowances whatsoever as are paied given or allowed to other scholers in the same Colledges halls or schooles by the foundac*i*ons Statut*es* or orders of the same any law statute Act or ordinance of or in the said Colledges hall or schooles or any of them to the contrary hereof not withstanding. Prouided alwayes that there be not at any tyme hereafter by force of this our ordinac*i*on graunt Constituc*i*on and declarac*i*on aboue one Child sent or brought to any Colledg hall or schoole within the space of three yeres so to be placed admitted and allowed as aforesaid. And we doe also of our speciall grace certain knowledge and meere moc*i*on will and ordayne declare and com*m*and by theise *presentes* unto all and singular the Deanes Provostes. Wardens Masters and governers of all and singular the said Colledges hall or Schooles by what name or names soeuer they be called or knowne that they do receave admitt and place all such Child or Children as shalbe sent or brought unto them by and with the discretion and allowance as aforesaid.

250

From the accession of Elizabeth on we find no more of the Chapel lists which used to be included in the accounts of the royal household; I cannot recall one such list after 1558. But fortunately at that time the *Old Cheque Book* begins and supplies us with far more information about members of the Chapel and their doings than the accounts give; so that the record of the Chapel from 1560 on is fairly complete, and may be consulted by anyone in Dr. Rimbault's edition of the *Cheque Book* for the Camden Society.

5. THE BODLEIAN REGISTER OF THE CHAPEL ROYAL

In Rawlinson MS D318, fol. 25–47, is a puzzling document which was not known to Rimbault, and which I have never seen referred to by anyone else. It is evidently a transcript, though possibly in part original, of certain accounts kept in the Chapel Royal. The greater part consists of a list of deaths and appointments, precisely similar to the *Cheque Book*, and identical with it in many cases, but possessing many items wanting in the *Cheque Book* and in other ways varying. The miscellaneous tables at the end, for example, which give interesting suggestions of the economy and expenses of the Chapel, are not found in the *Cheque Book*. The relations between the two records, so much alike and so dissimilar, are puzzling in the highest degree. I do not pretend to understand them.

The Bodleian manuscript, which for convenience I have called the *Register*, is bound up with others of unequal sizes. The folios are numbered straight through the book, the *Register* occupying numbers 25 to 47. It is incomplete, has no title, and is carelessly inscribed, in that part of it is written on the backs of folios, upside down. The handwriting changes in places which are noted in my transcript; in general the hands seem to be early or middle seventeenth century. The entries, at least as far as 1633, are copied in by the same hand. Toward the end occurs the date 1635, which seems about right for the whole document.

Important variations from the *Cheque Book* are pointed out in the notes. All entries inclosed in brackets are not found in Rimbault's edition of the *Cheque Book*.

⟨Fol. 25⟩

1560 [m^{r} Causter sworne Pistler the 25th of September].

1561 m^{r} Pater noster was sworne gent the 24th of march & m^{r} Jones Gospeller. & Thom*as* Rawlins yeoman of the Chapell.

1561 [mr Rawlins sworne gent the 27th of September].
1563 mr Thomas wyles sworne gent the eight of march.
1563 mr merton died the 22th of September and mr Parsons sworne sworne the 17th of October yeoman Pistler.
1563 mr walker was slayne the 27th of November [& mr Parsons sworne gent the 8th of Januarie].
1563 Mr wm mundy sworne gent the 21th off ffebruary.
1564 Mr Thomas Sampson sworne gent the 24th of Aprill at windsor.
1561 Thomas Birde Clerke of the check died[1] & mr morkocke made clerk of the Check.
1566 Mr Bower died mr of the Children and mr wm hunnis made mr the 15th of November.[2]

⟨Fol. 25*b*⟩

1566 mr Hechins died the 9th of November & Nich. morgan sworne gent the 9th of December.
1566 [James Causter sworne gent the 11th of December & John Ridley sworne Pistler the same daye].
1566 Mr Ailsworth died the 21th of Januarie[3] & mr Robert Greene sworne gent the last of the same.
1567 Mr John Denman died the 28th of maye. & John Addie sworne in his Roome the 27th of July.[4]
1567 Subdeane Angell died the 17th of August, & mr Morris sworne Subdeane the last of the same.
1568[5] Subdeane Morris died the 6th of maye and mr Grauesend swo: in his Roome the 15th eidem.[6]
1568 Mr wm Jewett[7] sworne gent the 18th daye of June.[8]
1569 Subdeane Grauesend died the 8th day of Aprill & Mr Tirwitt sworne Subdeane the 13th of October.
1569 Hugh zullie priest died the 11th of October & John Ridley sworne gent in his roome.[9]
1569 Mr Richard ffarrant sworne the 5th of November in Mr caustons Roome.

[1] "in Februarie."

[2] This is even worse than the *Cheque Book*, which dates his death 1563. He died 1561. The present entry is a telescoping of two in *C.B.*, one of the death of Bower, and one of the death of Richard Edwards in 1566 and the appointment of Hunnis.

[3] "22d."

[4] "June."

[5] *C.B.* inserts before this entry: "Jo: Hottost priest of Poules was sworne the 4th of December in Mr. Angell's place, Ao 11."

[6] "and Mr. Hottost substitute at Greenwich."

[7] "Ivett of West Chester."

[8] "in Mr. Norrice place."

[9] *C.B.* has it that Robert Goodale was sworn in "Sullyes" place on the 13th.

⟨Fol. 26⟩

1569 Roger Centon died the 11th[1] of ffebr. & Robt Goodall[2] sworne gent. in his place the 25th eidem.

1569 [Nicholas Brighton sworne yeoman Pistler the 25th of ffebruarie].

1569 Robert Parsons drowned at Newerk vpon trent[3] & wm Bird sworne Gent in his place the 22th of ffebruary.

1569 Wm Ednye bought Causters roome the first of October.

1571 Henry Alred died the 30th of march and Richard Granwall sworne gent at his first oth the 8th of Aprill.

1571 Robert Goodall died the 19th of September [& Nich. Beighton sworne gent.]. & Giles Cacott[4] sworne pistler the 13th of October.

1573 Giles Cacott died the 20th of June, & Barth. Mason sworne in his Roome the 10th of October.

1575 John Ridley died the 11th of Januarie [& Barth mason sworne gent.] & wm Rodinghurst[5] yeoman the 28th of ffebru.

1577[6] John Addie died the 9th of ffebru. [& wm Rodinghurst sworne gent.]

1578 & John savell yeoman the 28th of march.

⟨Fol. 26*b*⟩

1579 John Russell died the 30th of march [& John savill sworne gent.] & Richard Morrice sworne yeoman the same day.[7]

1580 [wm Bulman sworne gent Extraordinarie the 24th of Aprill by the Subdeane wth out Commandmt, either from the Queene or Deane wch was wth out example.][8]

1580 Thomas Rawlins died the 22th of August & Ellis Stempe sworne gent the 9th of November.

1580 John Savell was slaine the 25th of August [& Richard Morrice sworne gent] & Crue sharpe yeoman. the 9th of November.

1580 Richard ffarant died the 30th of November [& Crue Sharp sworne gent the 26th of ffebruary] & Anthony Todd yeoman the same daye.[9]

1580 wm Jones died the last of ffebruary & leonard davies sworne Gospeller in his roome. the 15th of maye.[10]

1581 [Mr morgan died the 9th of maye, & Anthony Todd sworne Gent the 15th of maye. in his Roome.]

[1] "16th."

[2] "Nich. Beighton . . . . from Lichfield."

[3] "the 25th of Januarie."

[4] "Carott."

[5] "Bodinghurst."

[6] "1578."

[7] "Richard Morrice sworne in his place the first of Aprill followinge Ao 21, from Glocester."

[8] This interesting item is one of many which do not appear in the *Cheque Book*.

[9] "havinge allowed Decr. and Januarie before at the Greenclothe, and wages from the deathe of Farrant."

[10] "and received paie from the 10th of Marche before."

⟨Fol. 27⟩

1582[1] M[r] morecock Clerke of the Cheque died the 15[th] of June [& m[r] more was made Clerke of the Check in his Roome.][2]

1582[1] W[m] Edney died the xiiij[th][3] of November of the Plague.

1582[4] John More, Clerke of the Check died the second of October, & [Thomas Samson was elected Clerke of the Check in his Roome.][5]

1582[4] Edmond Browne was sworne gent in m[r] Moore-Cocks roome the 25[th] of december, & Thomas Woodesson, & Robert Tallentire sworne yeoman in M[r] Ednies & m[r] moores Roomes the 25[th] of the same december.[6]

1583[7] w[m] Maperley died the last of maye, & w[m] Barnes sworne gospeller the 11[th] of October ffolowinge.

1583 Subdeane Tirwitt died the 10[th] of January & Robert Greene sworne Subdeane in his roome,[8] [& w[m] Barnes gent, Anthony harryson Gospel-

1584 ler] & Solomon Compton the 15[th] of maye.[9]

1584 W[m] Randell sworne Pistler the 17[th] of maye[10] [in M[r] Richmondes Roome.][11]

⟨Fol. 27*b*⟩

1585 M[r] Tallis died the 20[th][12] of November & m[r] Heveseed[13] sworne pistler the last of the same.[14]

1586[15] M[r] Rodenhurst died in January, & John Bull sworne in his place.[16]

1586 Isaack Burgis sworne in January.[17]

[1] "1581."

[2] In place of the bracketed item *C.B.* has: "and Edmund Browne sworne in his place the 25[th] of December A° 24°."

[3] "13[th]."

[4] "1581."

[5] In place of the bracketed item: "and Robert Tallentier sworne in his place the 25[th] of December A° 24°."

[6] These particulars are contained in *C.B.* but arranged under different entries. *C.B.* adds: "Note that these three persons had bothe wages and bord wages from the daie of the others deathes untill the daie of the swearinge by my Lord Chamberlaines warrant to the Greenclothe." Woodson was "of Poules."

[7] An entry precedes: "1583. Anthony Harrison sworne the of October in Mr. Morrice roome, who fledd beyond the seaes A° 25°, from Winsore."

[8] *C.B.* merely says: "Robert Greene sworne Subdeane the 14[th] of Februarie in Mr. Tirwitts roome."

[9] *C.B.* has: "1581 Salomon Compton was sworne pysteler the 15[th] of Maie A° 24°, from Cambridge."

[10] "the 15[th] of Februarie."

[11] In place of the item in brackets: "in Mr. Tirwitts roome, from Exon." This is obviously wrong; Green was subdean in Tirwitt's place.

[12] "23[d]."

[13] "Eveseed."

[14] "Childe there."

[15] "1585."

[16] "Childe there."

[17] "in Mr. Richmondes roome."

1587 Tymothy Greene sworne the 12th of June in Mr Couchis[1] Roome.

1588 George waterhouse Admitted gentleman at his first othe in Solomon Comptons Roome[2] who was displaced.

1588 Edward Peirce sworne the 16th of march in Ellis Stemps Roome.

1589 Robert Allison sworne the 12th of December in Mr Palfrymans Roome, [& John Stephens sworne the same daye in Ordinary by the Lord Chamberlains Command, ffor the neaxt place that should become voyde.]

1590 [Mr Wyles died in August] & John Stephen sworne in his place the 11th of the same.

1591 John hewlett sworne the 23th of maye in Mr Blithmans Roome.

1591 Richard Plumley sworne the [10th] of August in Mr Jewetts Roome.

⟨Fol. 28⟩

1591 Anthony Anderson sworne the 12th of October in Mr Mundayes Roome.

1591 Thomas Gould sworne the 14th of November in Mr Beightons Roome.

1592 Thomas Morley sworne the 24th of July in Subdeane Greens Roome, & mr Anderson sworne Subdeane.[3]

1592 Peter wright sworne the 23th of November in Mr Benbowes Roome.

1592 Thomas Maddoxe sworne the 10th of Januarie in Mr hottofts[4] Roome.

1593 Anthony Anderson Subdeane died of the Plague the 10th of October, & Leonard Davies sworne Subdeane the 15th of the same Moneth, [and wm lawrence Pistler.][5]

1593 James Davies sworne the 29th of Januarie in Tymothe Greens Roome.

1595 John Amery sworne the 4th of december in in Mr Maddoxe Roome.

1596 Robert Paternoster died the last of July & robert Stuckey sworne in his place the 20th of August.

⟨Fol. 28b⟩

1597 wm hunnis died the 6th of June,[6] & Nathaniell Giles sworne[7] in his Roome the 9th of the same.

1598 John Bauldwin sworne the 20th of August in Robert Tallentires Roome.[8]

1599 ffrancis wynbowrow[9] sworne Pistler in Anthony Todds Roome the 26th of march.

[1] "Gooches." [2] "in July."

[3] *C.B.* splits this entry into two. The second runs: "1592. Anthony Anderson sworne Subdeane the 26th of July in Subdeane Greenes roome."

[4] "Mr. Hottost's place, from Heryford."

[5] A separate entry in *C.B.*: "1593. Mr. Laurence from Poules was sworne the 17th of Octr. in Mr. Anderson's place."

[6] "Master of the Children."

[7] "gent and Master of the Children."

[8] "Robert Tallentire died the 15th of August, and Jo. Baldwin sworne in his place the 20th of the same, from Winsore."

[9] "Widborow."

1600 Edward Peirce yelded vp his place for the m^r^ship of the Children of Poules, & John heathman sworne in his place the 15^th^ of August.
1601 George waterhouse died the 18^th^ of ffebru. & Arthur Cocke sworne in his place the eight of march.
1601 Isaack Burgis, drowned Cominge out of the lowe Countries before
1602 Christmas, & Stephen Boughton sworne in his place the 25 of Aprill.
1602 George wooddesson was sworne the 7^th^ of October in Thom*as* Morlays Roome.
1602 w^m^ lawes sworne the first of Januarie in Thom*as* Sharps Roome.
1602 Anthony kirkeby sworne the [9^th^] of march in John heathmans Roome.
1603 John wooddesson sworne the 2^d^ of July in George Bucks Roome.
1603 Edmund Shergold sworne the first of Januarie in w^m^ Barnes Roome.

⟨Fol. 29⟩

1603 Edmund Hooper sworne the first of March in w^m^ Randolls Roome.
1604 Orlando Gibbons sworne the 21^th^ of March in Arthur Cocks Roome.[1]
1605 Richard Coton was sworne the 12^th^ of November in Bartholemy Masons Roome.[2]
[About this tyme Rob. Hand yeoman of y^e^ vestry dyed and John Davies sworne grome in his place, who after ward*es* sould his place to Jan Nicholas and the same John Davies was sworne yeoman of the vestry extraordinary.][3]
1605 Thomas wooddesson solde his place to w^m^ west [who was to enter into Pistl*er*s wagis the first of Aprill followinge.][4]
1606 Edmond Browne died the 27^th^ of Aprill, & Randoll Tinker sworne in his place the same daye.
1606[5] w^m^ lawrence died the 10^th^ of November, & David henly sworne in his place [probacion*er* for one yeare[6]] the third of December.
1606 Richard Granwall died the second of march, & Thom*as* Paine sworne in his Roome the 27^th^ of the same. 1607.
1607 George Cook was sworne the 21^th^ of Januarie, in Edmond Shergolds[7] Roome.

[1] "Arthur Cock died the 26^th^ of Januarie, and Orlando Gibbons sworne in his roome the 21^st^ of Marche followinge."

[2] "Barth. Mason, Priest, died the last of October, and Rich. Coton, Minister, from Winsore was sworne in his place the 12th of November."

[3] A note inserted in the manuscript, running across the top of the page and down the right margin.

[4] "Who was sworne in his place the 20th of Marche."

[5] An entry in *C.B.* precedes this: "Randoll Tinker died of the Plague the 20th of Sept., and Luke Jones of Poules was sworne in his place the last of the same."

[6] Bracketed in manuscript, but also not in *C.B.*

[7] He "died the 19th of Januarie."

1608 [John Patten eldest yeoman of the vestrie made over his place the first of maye vnto Christofer Clarke, whoe was then sworne Groome, & henry Alred eldest yeoman & Jan Nicholas youngest yeoman. And the same tyme John Patten was sworne yeoman againe extraordinarie.]

⟨Fol. 29*b*⟩

1608 [Ralph ffletcher Sergeant of the vestry made over his place vnto Cuthbert Joyner, who was sworne Sergeant the 26th of June, & Ralph ffletcher was the same daye sworne Sergeant extraordinarie.]

1608 Thom*as* gould died the 28th of July, & John Clarke sworne the 24th of August.[1]

1609 Thomas Paine died [the 28th of July, & John Clarke sworne the 24th of August.[2]]

1609 Robert Allison solde his place the 8th of ffebru vnto humfrie Bache, being the same daye sworne [Gospell*er* at the first.]

1609 Robert Stuckey died the last of ffebru & Thom*as* Peirce sworne the 24th of march.

1610 [Christofer Clark groome of the vestry resigned his place the 22th of december, & wm lowther sworne theirin the same daye.]

1611 Wm lawes resigned his place the 5th of maye vnto Ezechiell waad. who was sworne [Pistl*er*] the same daye, [to enter into paye the first of July neaxt after the date Aforesayd by order of our Deane.]

⟨Fol. 30⟩

1611 [Henry Alred yeoman of the vestry for manie disorders, & for suspicion of stealing of three Coopes out of his Mates vestry at Greenwch, was put out of his place the 7th of June, & wm lowther sworne that daye.]

1611 [Henry Eveseed was sworne groome of the vest*ry* the 19th of June.

1611 Richard Plumley died the third of October, & John ffrost sworne in his Roome the 5th of Novemb*er*.

1613 Robert Stone of the age of iiij^{xx} xvij yeares died the second of July, and Mathew White Minister was elected & Admitted Gospell*er* at the first the second of November followinge.[3]

[1] "Childe of the Chappell."

[2] This entry has evidently been botched by the scribe's slipping into the one above it. The *C.B.* reads: "Tho. Paine died the 4th of Januarie, and George Sheffeild of Durham was sworne in his place the 6th of Feb. followinge."

[3] "and was sworne the 27th daie of December then next ensuinge: the wages of Mr. Stone from his death to Mr. Whit's admission was disposed of by the Deane of his Majestes Chappell."

June 1613 John Bull Doctor, went byond the seas wthout leave, & was admitted into the Archdukes service,[1] & Peter Hopkins was sworne in his Roome the 27th of December followinge the wagis[2] in the meane time disposed of by the Deane.

1614 Mathew white resigned his place vnto my lord Deane. the 25th of September, & w^{m} Crosse his Lo: ^{ps} servant was Admitted & sworne in his place the 27th of the same.

1615 [w^{m} ward sworne Groome of the vestuarie extraordinarie for the tuning of the Organs by warrant from the Deane.]

⟨Fol. 30*b*⟩

1614 Henry Eveseed died the xviijth of November And w^{m} Heather was sworne in his place the 27th of march ffolowinge the wages in the 1615 meane tyme was disposed of by the Deane.

1615[3] Thomas Sampson Clerke of the Check was drowned the 24th of Aprill, & John Myners was sworne in his place the 4th daye of June followinge, & John Hewlett (havinge executed the place of Clark of the Cheke ffor M^{r} Sampson about eight years was Allowed to be Cherk (*sic*) of the Check by the Consent of the Companie.

1615 John Myners died the second of July, & Thom*as* Daye sworne in his place the 30th of September followinge, the wagis, &c [vt supra][4]

1615 John Baldwin died the 28th of August, & Martin Otto sworne the 30th of September.[5]

1615 [John Nicholas eldest yeoman of the vestry solde his place vnto Richard Patten, who was sworne Groome the xxxth of September, & henry eveseed then sworne youngest yeoman.][6]

1616 David Henley died the xijth of August, & John Greene being Allowed the wagis of the Pistl*er* by the deane, & standing vppon p*r*obac*i*on of his maners & good behavio*ur* for one yeare, [did soe misdemeane himselfe & also married a second wife (the first living) was dismissed his Ma^{ties} service the 27th of September.][7]

⟨Fol. 31⟩

1616 Edmond Nelham was sworne in John Greenes Roome the 5th[8] of November.

[1] "and entered into paie there about Michaelmas."

[2] "from Michaelmas unto the daie of the swearing of the said Peter Hopkins."

[3] Two entries precede this in *C.B.*: "1615. John Miners gent was sworne gent in ordinarie the 28th of Marche for the next place in the Chappell, of what parte soever." "1615. John Amyon of Westchester was sworne gent extraordinarie the 13th daie of Aprill."

[4] I.e., "the wages disposed by the Deane for that quarter."

[5] "by the procurement of our gracious Ladie Queene Ann."

[6] Note that a Henry Eveseed died November 18, 1614.

[7] The bracketed facts are contained in a separate entry in *C.B.*

[8] "6th."

1617[1] Peter wright died the 27th of Januarie & walter Porter sworne in his place the first day of febru.

1620[2] Martin Otto died the second daye of July, and Roger Nightingall Sworne in his place the xxth of the same.

[About this tyme Lancelott lo: Bp of winton was sworne Deane of the chappell in the presence of the Earle of pembroke lo: Chamberlain in the vestry at whitehall, by the subd of the Chappell.][3]

1620 [Henry Eveseed for many disorders comitted & Approved against him, was dismissed from his Mates service the third of march, & Thomas Pannell was sworne Groome, & Richard Patten yeoman.]

1621 John ffrost Clerk, was sworne in Ordinarie the 26th of Aprill, for the next place of a base that should fall voyd in his mates Chappell.

1621 Edmond Hooper died the 14th of July, & Thomas Tomkins, was sworne in his place, August the 2d.

1621 Anthony Harrison died the 20th of ffebru. & John ffrost was sworne in his place the 14th of Aprill 1623, the wagis in the meane tyme was disposed of by the deane for prickinge of songs, & for a newe sett of bookes for the Chappell.[4]

⟨Fol. 31*b*⟩

1623 Wm Bird[5] died the 4th day of July, & John Croker was Admitted probationer in his Roome the 24th of December.[6]

1623 John Amery died the 18th of July, and Raphe Amner sworne the 16th of December, the wagis disposed of by the lord Deane.

[1] *C.B.* has the following entry preceding this:

"1616. Walter Porter, by warraunt from the reverend Father in God James Lord Bisshopp of Winton and Deane of his Majestes Chappell, was sworne gent of his Majestes said chappell in ordinarie, without paye, for the next place that shall happen to be and shall fall voyd by the deathe of any tenor that now is in ordinarie in the said chappell, and tooke and receaved his oathe to that effect the 5th daie of Januarie the yeare above-said, and paid for his oathe five poundes and other duties."

[2] *C.B.* has these entries preceding:

"1619. Roger Ni(gh)tengall was sworne the 29th day of June in ordinary for the next place of a base that shall fall voyd in his Majestes Chappell."

"1620. Memorandum, that of late ther(e) was a question proposed that Jo. Hewlett was not lawfully elected to be clark of the check uppon the death of Mr. Sampson, who died five yeares past, wheruppon ther was a vestery called by Mr. Davies, Subdeane, on the 20th of June 1620, and ther(e) by a scruteny he was ellected and allowed to be a clerk of the check by the major part of the gent. being then 25 in number."

"1620 June 29. Thomas Peirse, servant to the Right Reverend Father in God Lancellott Bishop of Winton and Deane of his Majestes Ordinary, was sworne a gent of his Majestes Chappell in Ordinary, to enter into pay uppon the deathe of Mr. James Davies, if he chance to live so longe."

[3] Inserted in a different hand.

[4] "and other disposings and allowances by his said Lordship."

[5] "a Father of Musick"

[6] "for a yeare of probacion of his good behaviour and civill carriage, or else to resigne and yeald up the promise graunted to him at the yeares end, and so to receave the wages of the pisteler in the meane tyme"

1623 Leonard Davies Subdeane died the ixth of Novembe*r* And Stephen Boughton M^{r} of Art*es* was sworne in the place of Subdeane[1] *by Lancelott Lo: B. of Winton and dean of y^{e} chappell*[2] And John Cooke sworne Pistler the 16th of December.[3]

1623 James Davies died the 24th of March, & Thom*as* Peirce Jun sworne in his place the 26th.[4]

1625 Orlando Gibbons died the vth of June,[5] & Thom*as* warrick sworne in his place the first of July & to Receave the paye of Pistler.

1625 John Croker died the 25th of August, & George wooddesson Jun sworne in his place the 20th of November.[6]

1625 John Cooke died the 12th of September, & henry lawes was sworne in his place the first of Januarie ffollowinge.[7]

1625 Peter Hopkins died the 25th of November, & Richard Boughton was sworne the 27th of June[8] followinge, the wagis in the meane tyme disposed of by the Deane.

⟨Fol. 32⟩

1625 [Memoran*dum* that vpon the xixth of November by king Charles warrant vnder his hand signed was Thomas Meller sworne Joynt Sergeant of his Ma^{tes} vestrie, & Robe*r*t Colman & Silvester Wilson yeomen of the same, & Thom*as* Meller to recea*ve* such wagis as doth belonge to the sergeant, fro*m* his Ma^{tes} first entrance vnto his Crowne; & Robe*r*t Colman, & Silvester Wilson to recea*ve* xij^{d} a peece p*er* diem, & v^{li} a peece p*er* Ann*um* for their ffee, & they to haue prioritie of place aboue the Sergeant & yeomen Respectively accordinge as other his servant*es* in other places.]

1626[9] [Roger Evans by warrant fro*m* the Lo: deane was sworne Bellringer the 20th daye of Aprill vppon the daeth of Sampson Rowden.]

[1] "the 14th of Decr."

[2] *. . . .*, an insertion by another hand. The same meaning attaches wherever else asterisks are used.

[3] "with this proviso, that the whole wages to the end of the quarter should be given unto Mr. Subdeane Davies wiffe by our Lord Deane his order"

[4] "in the presence of Rich. Coton, substitute, John Stephens, John Hewlett, Frauncis Widborow, Wm. West, Roger Nightingale, Tho. Tomkins, Luke Jones and Ralph Amner."

[5] "being then Whitsonday, at Canterbury, wher the Kinge was then to receave Queene Mary who was then to com out of Fraunce"

[6] "pisteler and gospeller, by the death of Mr. John Cooke, and lastly gent uppon the death of Mr. Hopkins; the wages in the meane tyme was imployd in pricking of songes by my Lord our Deanes order."

[7] "Pistoler, and Mr. Warrick gent, and George Wooddeson, the younger, gospeller, as above said: the wages in the meane tyme was disposed of by our Lord Deane."

[8] "the 29th of Aprill, 1626."

[9] The following entry occurs in *C.B.*: "1625 Memorandum, that Mr. John Tomkins, Organist of St. Paule London, was sworne extraordinarie gentleman of his Majestes Chappell for the next place of an organist there, or the place of Anthony Kirkby, which of them shall first fall voyde."

1626 [Memorand*um* that the Right Reverend father in God Doctor Andrewes, Bishop of winton & Deane of his Ma^ties^ Chappell died the 25^th^ daye of September at ffower of the Clock in the Morninge.]

⟨Fol. 32*b*⟩

1626 [M^d^ that W^m^ Lord Bishop of Bathe & Wells was sworne deane of his Ma^tes^ Chappell, in the p*r*esence of the lo: Chamberlaine in the vestrie the 6^th^ of October *by stephen Boughton subd*.]

1626 ffrancis wilbowrow died the 28^th^ of october & John Tomkins sworne pistler in his place. Richard Boughton Gospeler & henry Lawes Gent the third of November.

1626 Crue Sharpe died the 21^th^ of december, & thom*a*s Raiment sworne epistl*er* in his place the 30^th^ of Januarie, Jo: Tomkins Gospeler & Richard Boughton gent.

1627 Luke Jones died the 18^th^ daye of July, And Richard Sandy sworne ePistler the 19^th^ of July Thom*a*s Raiment Gospeller, & John Tomkins gentleman.

1627 W^m^ Heather Doctor, died [the 27^th^] of July, And Thomas Laughton sworne ePistler in his place the [12^th^] of October followinge the wagis in the Interim was disposed of by the deane. Richard Sandy was sworne gospeler & Thomas Raiment was sworne gent.

⟨Fol. 33⟩

1627 John Hewlett Clarke of the Cheque died the 11^th^ of ffebruarie, & John Stephens was elected by the Companie, Clerk of the Cheque in his Roome. Nathaniell Pownall sworne Pistler, Thomas laughton Gospeller & Richard Sandy gent the 12^th^ of the same.

1626 [Be it remembered that vppon the ix^th^ of July John Burward was sworne Groome of his Ma^tes^ vestery Extraordinarie for the tuninge & mendinge of his Ma^tes^ Organs when hee shalbe required, as dothe more largely Appeare by the lo: deanes warrant for yt purpose.]

1630 Humfrie Bache died the first of Aprill & George Nutbrowne was sworne epistler in his Roomee (*sic*) Thom*a*s Laughton Gentleman & Nathainell Pownall Gospeller the sayd first of Aprill.

1633 Doctor Peirc surrendered his place in September & Thom*a*s Holmes was sworne pistler in his Rome, [Nathainell Pownall Gent, & George Nutbrowne Gospell*er*. Tho: Holmes to ent*er* in Paye the first of Januarie next ffolowinge.]

⟨Fol. 33*b*⟩[1]

1633 [Dr. Giles m^r^ of the Children deceased Ja. 24. Thomas day was sworne m^r^ of y^e^ children in his place. George Nuttbrowne was sworne gent. Thomas Holmes gospeller and Thomas Hazard Epistler the the (*sic*) 25 of ffebruary.]

[1] From here on the entries are in another hand, seemingly the same which made previous annotations. In *C.B.* there is a gap in the entries from 1633 to 1638.

1635 [Thomas pounell eldest yeoman of y^e^ vestry deceased in January. Thomas Walker was sworne eldest yeoman John pountney youngest yeoman, and Hugh Jenkins Groome sworne ffeb. 13.]

1636 [Thomas Maller seriaunt of the vestry deceased about midsom*m*er and Thomas Walker was sworne seriaunt in his place Decemb. 24. beinge xpas eve, and the dead pay of the seriaunt*es* place was disposed of by y^e^ Deane of the Chappell. Hugh Jenkins was sworne youngest yeoman, Jo. pountney eldest yeoman, and Roger Judd was sworne groome ffebruary 18.]

1636 [John Stevens a tenor and Clerke of the Check deceased
Maij, m^r^ Thomas Day was sworne Clerke of the Check. Tho.
1637 Holmes gent. Tho. Hazard ghospeller and Epistler April 12, 1637. The dead pay was disposed of by y^e^ Deane of the Chappell.]

⟨Fol. 34⟩

1637 [Thomas Holmes a base deceased Martij 24 beinge the Eve of Easter and the Annuntiation Tho Hazard was sworne gent, Rich. Jenninges ghospeller and John Cobb Organist was sworne Epistler Sept. 15, 1638, the dead pay was disposed of by the Deane of y^e^ Chappell.][1]

1638 [Thomas Walker seriaunt of the vestry deceased in and John pountney eldest yeoman was sworne seriaunt Maij 3° Hugh Jenkins eldest yeoman and Thomas kithermister was sworne Groome Maij 13°.

1638 John Clark [a tenor deceased of the plague] in July, John Cobb was sworne gospeller [and Richard portman organist was sworne Epistler vpon Michaelmas day.]

1638 John Tomkins [an excellent Organist] deceased Sept. 27. [John Cobb was sworne gent] Rich portman Ghospeller, [and John Hardinge a Counter tenor was sworne Epistoler Oct. 1°.]

1638[2] [Thomas Laughton a countertenor in his fury slinging a payre of sizers at his wife strake her in the head whereof she dyed w^th^in 3 dayes after vz the last of December, 1638 for w^ch^ he was deprived of his place in y^e^ Chappell, and Richard Wattkine was sworne a probationer in his
1639 place March 15. 1639.]

⟨Fol. 34*b*⟩

1639 [George Woodeson a Counter tenor dyed the and Mathew Peare was sworne probationer in his place beinge a tenor the 10 of June 1640.]

1639 [John ffrost a tenor dyed the 7^th^ of March 1639. Thomas Kitherminster a groome of y^e^ vestry resigned his place and William Williams was sworne groome in his place the (*sic*)]

[1] *C.B.* has in place of this entry: "1638. Thomas Holmes dyed at Salsburye at our Lady Day, and John Hardinge was sworne in his place."

[2] From here on the entries are in varying shades of ink and different hands; probably they are the original, contemporary entries. The *C.B.* has a hiatus between 1638 and 1660, which the *Register* fills as far as it goes.

1640 [William alias Webb a tenor was sworne a probationer in John ffrostes place the 17 of June anno domini 1640.]

1640 [William Kros a Counter tenor deceased the 14 day of June 1640. he dyed in Wells.]

[Hugh Jenkins deceased eldest yeoman of the vestry the 27th of August William Williams was sworne yeoman and Augustine Cleveland was sworne groome the of October, 1640.]

1640 [Augustine Cleveland was sworne groome of the vestry the (*sic*)]

⟨Fol. 35⟩

1641 [Richard Boughton a base deceased ye 24th of July 1641 he heald both Windsor and the chappell togeather.]

1641 [George Woodson a tenor deceased the first day of ffebruary 1641. he heald both the Chappell and Westminster togeather.]

1641 [James Try a tenor was sworne a probationer in George Woodsons place the day of ffebruary who heald togeather wth the Chappel a place in ye Church and Quire of Westminster.]

1641 [Thomas Lowe a base of St Paules church London was sworne into the place of Richard Boughton ye day of ffebruary.]

1642 [John ffrost gent of ye Chappell and Chanter of Westminster church held togeather wth ye Chappell deceased the viijth day of May beinge Sunday about one of ye Clock in the morninge. he was a base and of extraordinary sufficiency for his quality allso of honesty and good (?)[1]

1642 And Woodcock a master of Arts of Kinges College in Cambridge a countertenor was sworne probationer in his place vpon Michaelmas day after.]

1643 [James Trie a tenor deceased about September he held both westminster and the chappell togeather.]

⟨Fol. 35*b*⟩

1643 [William West a tenor deceased in November.]

⟨Fol. 47⟩[2]

A direction for the Castinge vp of the perditions Euery moneth

ffirst make one Entire Sum of all the perdicions both of dayly wayters and by wayters.

Next deuide that sum amongst the dayly wayters by Equall Portions. Then deduct from Euerie one his perdicions and write his perquisitts before his name.

[1] Word illegible.

[2] The following pages are separated from the preceding by several blank leaves. The entries are inverted so that one must turn the manuscript upside down, and beginning at the back (fol. 47) read toward the parts transcribed above. This part of the *Register*, too, is without title or explanation. It is not found in the *Cheque Book*.

Lastly Cast vp the perdic*i*ons of the wayters, and the perdic*i*ons of those dayly way*t*ers whose negligence haue depriued them of perquisitt*es* And yf that Sum make vpp the Some of the perquisitt*es* then y^e^ Accoumpt is Right.

Maye Anno d*omi*ni 1635.

⟨Fol. 46*b*⟩

The President for the Monethly Dyett

Diete Rectorum Clericorum Gen*e*rosorum et Aliorum Capelle D*omi*ni Regis Caroli. A Primo die Mens*is* Januarij vsq*ue* ad vltimum diem eiusdem mens*is* viz p*ro* xxxi^o^ diebus inclusive, Anno Quinto Regni Caroli Regis &c. Anno d*omi*ni 1629.

A President when ther is A remove in any moneth

Diete Rectorum &c till you come to inclusive, et p*ro* vna Remoc*i*one A Grinwich vsq*ue* hampton Court, viz p*ro* xv milliarum, Anno Sexto Regni Caroli Regis &c Anno d*omi*ni 1630.

A President for the Quart*e*rs ffee

Vadea Rectorum Clericorum Generosor*um* et Aliorum Capelle d*omi*ni Regis Caroli A Primo die Mens*is* Julij vsque ad vltimum diem mens*is* septembris viz pro $\overset{xx}{iiij}$ xij diebus inclusive. Anno Sexto regni Caroli regis &c. Anno d*omi*ni 1630.

A President when ther is Two Removes in A moneth

Diete Rectorum Clericorum gen*e*rosorum et Aliorum Capelle d*omi*ni Regis Caroli, A primo die mens*is* Octobris vsq*ue* ad vltimum diem eiusdem Mens*is*, viz p*ro* xxxj diebus inclusive, et pro vna remoc*i*one A grinwich vsq*ue* windsor, et retro, windsor vsq*ue* Grinwich, deinde pro Altera remoc*i*one A Grinwich vsq*ue* hampton Court in toto miliarium lxv. Anno decimo Regni Caroli regis &c. Anno d*omi*ni 1633.

⟨Fol. 46⟩

	Childr*e*n	Remoovings	Myles
	xv^s^	ffrom Grinwich to windsor	xxv
		Sum*m*a.....iiij^li^ x^s^ x^d^	
xv^d^	vj^s^	ffr*o*m w*i*ndsor to hampton court	xj
		Sum*m*a.....xl^s^ v^d^	
	ix^s^	ffr*o*m windsor to Richmount	xiiij
		Sum*m*a.....lj^s^ viij^d^	
xv^d^	vj^s^	fro*m* Richmount to Grinwich	xj
		Sum*m*a.....xl^s^ v^d^	
	ix^s^	ffr*o*m Grinwich to hampton court	xv
		Sum*m*a.....liiij^s^ vj^d^	

⟨Fol. 46⟩

	Children	Remoovings	Myles
ij^{s} vj^{d}	vj^{s}	from hampton court to whithall Summa.....xliiij^{s} vj^{d}	xij
	iij^{s}	from whitehall to Grinwich Summa.....xviij^{s} ij^{d}	v
ij^{s} vj^{d}	iij^{s}	from whitehall to richmount Summa.....xxvj^{s} iiij^{d}	vj
⟨fol. 45*b*⟩	iij^{s}	from hampton court to Richmount Summa.....xv^{s} iiij^{s}	iiij
	xij^{s}	from whitehall to windsor Summa.....iij^{li} xij^{s} viij^{d}	xx

when it doth happen that the Remoove is. a–11–6–7. or –12 myles or the like, the odde pence to the Children and yeomen, are the Clarke of the Checks ffee, as for example, llooke one the margent of the other syde.

⟨Fol. 45⟩

The xij Children for board wagis haue x^{d} apeece *per* diem viz x^{s} *per* diem.

The gent of the Chappell, the Gospeller, the Epistler, the Sergeant of the Vestuarie, to each of them, haue at every Remoove for Beveridge a penny a myle.

The yeomen and Groome of the vestuarie haue to each of them for every fyve myles Remoovinge iiij^{d}—To each Child for every fyve myles iij^{d}—And if there be any odd myle more or lesse they haue a penny a peece for the same, As for example, they haue for remooving fower mile iij^{d}, for sixe miles iiij^{d}.

The master of the children hath for their Apparell out of the kyngs exchequer xl^{li} *per* Annum.

⟨Fol. 44*b*⟩

The Clarke of the Checke hath out of every months bord wagis from each Gentleman Gospeler, the Epistler and Sergeant -viij^{d}- & for each yeoman & Groome out of every moneth iij^{d}, & from the master of the Children for every moneth ij^{s} vj^{d}.

Out of w^{ch} paymentes the Clark of the Checke payeth to the Cofferers Clarks for every moneths boord wagis fyve shillings and to the Common servant monethly, as he Receaves yt–x^{s}.

The Remooves of all such gent, or others as come not to the Court in the moneth of remoove to give their Attendance is the Clarke of the Checkes ffee.

All dead Payes from the death of any Gent vntill the swearing of him yt is to suckseed in the place, is of Ancient Costome due to the Clarke of the Check. provided another be chosen before the end of the moneth afterwards the dead pay goeth to the Kinge or as he shall please to dispose of w^{ch} of late hath beene ymployed for Chappell bookes of Services and anthems and prickinge of them.

⟨Fol. 44⟩

The Clarke of the Check is not to be chosen Steward of the Chappell feast without his owne Consent.

The number of the gentlemen that receave vij ob *per* diem ffee is xxxj.

The Gospeller and the Serjeant receave for ffee iiij^{d} ob *per* diem, and the epistler iij^{d} *per* diem, The xij Children—x^{s} *per* diem.

The Two yeomen and the Groome haue for boord wagis to each of y^{em} x^{d} *per* diem.

The yeomen haue for ffee iij^{d} a peece *per* diem, & the Groome—xl^{s} *per* Annum.

The kynge doth geve in Rewarde at Newyears day to the Gent for their newe years Guift—xiij^{li} vj^{s} viij^{d} fr*om* the Tre*asurer* of the Chamb^{r} the ffee their is vj^{s} viij^{d} and for the Children—vj^{li} xiij^{s} iiij^{d}—the ffee is iij^{s} iiij^{d}.

⟨Fol. 43*b*⟩

1	January	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}							
		xx									
2	ffebruary	iiij	xiij^{li}	viij^{s}	viij^{d}			xx			
3	March	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}		iijC	iiij	viij^{li}	xiij^{s}	ix^{d}.	
		xx									
0	Quart*ers* ffee	iiij	xiiij^{li}	viij^{s}	ix^{d}						
		xx									
4	Aprill	iiij	xviij^{li}	xx^{d}							
5	Maye	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}				xx			
		xx				iijC	iiij	xij^{li}	xiij^{d}	ob.	
6	June	iiij	xviij^{li}	xx^{d}							
		xx									
0	Quart*ers* ffee	iiij	xv^{li}	ix^{s}	vij^{d}	ob					
7	July	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}							
8	August	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}							
		xx						xx			
9	Septemb^{r}	iiij	xviij^{li}	xx^{d}		iijC	iiij	xv^{li}	viij^{s}	vj^{d}	
		xx									
0	Quart*ers* ffee	iiij	xvj^{li}	x^{s}	vj^{d}						
10	October	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}							
		xx						xx			
11	November	iiij	xviij^{li}	xx^{d}							
12	December	C^{li}	viij^{s}	ij^{d}		iijC	iiij	xv^{li}	viij^{s}	vj^{d}	
		xx									
0	Quart*ers* ffee	iiij	xvj^{li}	x^{s}	vj^{d}						
	Summa total*is*	m vC	lxxj^{li}	xj^{s}	x^{d}	ob.					

not being leape yeare — when it is leape yeare ad to y^{e} month of february—xlvj^{s} vj^{d} & to the Quart*ers* wagis—xx^{s} x^{d} ob.

⟨Fol. 43⟩

A coppy of the peticion geven to y^e^ kinge for pardon of our subsidies.

To the Kinges most excellent Ma^tie^ The humble peticion of the subdeane, Chaplaines Gent. and officers of your Ma^ties^ Chappell Royall, and vestrie.

Most Gracious soveraigne.

Your Ma^ties^ sayd poore servants by reason of their small allowance for their dayly service havinge bene tyme out of mind pardoned their payment of subsidies both by your gracious self, and Highnes noble progenitors doe humbly beseach that the same Grace and favour may be still continued vnto them, especially consideringe the hardnes of the tymes are growen to be such that if the payment of subsidies graunted this parliament by the Clergie and Temporalty be layd vpon them they cannot subsist to maintayne them selves in their due attendance.

Wherefore they humbly beseach your sacred Ma^tie^ to take their poore estate in to your Gracious consideracion that they may be pardoned the payment of all the sayd subsidies as allwayes heretofore they have beene

And they shall ever pray &c.

subscribed thus

At the Court at Hampton Court 12 January 1641. His Ma^tie^ is Graciously pleased to graunt the peticioners this their humble suite, and that the Clerk of y^e^ signet attendinge *pre*pare a Bill thereof accordingly fitt for his Ma^ties^ Royall signature.

Tho. Aylesbury

⟨Fol. 42*b*⟩

The Kinges Ma^ties^ Progress into Scotland 1633. in May.

A peticion was dd to his Ma^tie^ for foure hundred pownds, for a shipp to carry the gent, and their goods.

Three hundred pounds were graunted, w^ch^ they had by privy seale out of the exchequer.

A shipp was graunted allso, and fifty three pownds add mony more graunted by privy seale procured by m^r^ secretary Cooke beinge one of the Com*m*issioners for the Admiralty after the com*m*issioners appoynted for the orderinge of the progress had considered yt.

The privye seale for this 53^li^ add mony was dd to S^r^ Sampson Dorrell victuler for the Navie w^ch^ he rec fro*m* the exchequer and the mony was dd by him to M^r^ Sidenham the captaine of the shipp called the Dread nought, where in the gent of the Chappell and officers of the vestry were w^th^ the stuff, and allso the children of the Chappell.

The 300^li^ was distributed and disposed of.

The charges of procuringe of the privy seale and the fees of the exchequer came vnto—16^li^.

⟨Fol. 42⟩

There went into Scotland of the gent of the Chappell 19. they had 12^li^ a peece w^ch^ came vz in toto to—228^li^.

There went of the children of y^{e} chappell eight they had amongst them dd to their m^{r} a great part vz—12^{li}.

The seriaunt of the vestry had a great part vz—12^{li}.

One yeoman and the groome of the vestry then goinge had vj^{li} a peece in toto—12^{li}.

The 2 servants of the Chappell & vestry had 40^{s} a peece vz—4^{li}.

The remainder of the 300^{li} was left remayninge in the Deane of the Chappells hands w^{ch} was distributed amongst such gent of the Chappell as he thought best deserved in that iourney. of w^{ch} the subdeane had v^{li} and divers of the gent 20^{s} a peece and I think the seriaunt of the vestry had 20^{s}.

The Lo Chamberlaine then gave his warrant to the M^{r} of the Kinges Barge for barges and lighters to carry the ⟨fol. 41*b*⟩ gent and the rest wth their stuff, copes, surplesses etc. fro*m* whitehall to the shipp w^{ch} lay then at Tillbury hope (?) neare Graves End.

HAROLD N. HILLEBRAND

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

SOME VERSIONS OF *TIMON OF ATHENS* ON THE STAGE

No Shakespearean play has a stage history more eccentric than that of *Timon of Athens*. At least fifteen different English versions of the play have been produced; German dramatists, from Schiller to Bulthaupt, have been interested in variations upon the Timon theme; and the influence of the play may be found in dramatic literatures so varied as those of France, America, and Japan. Yet real interest in Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*, as an acting play, did not begin until the last quarter of the seventeenth century, long after its appearance in the First Folio as a Shakespearean tragedy. It was entered on November 8, 1623, upon the Stationer's Register as one of the plays "not formerly entered to other men." No positive evidence exists of its having been acted either before or after this date until Thomas Shadwell's version of the play in 1678. We are, however, inclined to accept Dr. Nicholson's "tolerably decisive proof,"[1] based upon the arrangement of the stage directions, that the play was acted before 1623. That during the latter half of the seventeenth century Timon was well known as the hero of a legend and a play is certain. *The Shakespeare Allusion Book* says, somewhat indefinitely, that "Sir William Davenant's company, acted . . . . after 1671, ... Timon of Athens."[2] Robert Gould refers to *Timon* in *The Playhouse, A Satyr*, 1685.[3] J. Drake speaking in 1699 of *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Timon of Athens* says: "Twould be impertinent to trouble the Reader with a minute examination of Plays so generally known and approved."[4]

Timon of Athens, or The Man-Hater, by Thomas Shadwell, was acted at Dorset Garden in December, 1678. In the "Epistle Dedicatory," in which occurs Shadwell's famous declaration that *Timon of Athens* was now "made into a play," the author deigns to pay

[1] *Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society* (1874), p. 252, n. 2.

[2] John Munro, *The Shakespeare Allusion Book*, II, 322. This version was an alteration by Davenant and Shadwell.

[3] *Ibid.*, II, 296.

[4] *Ibid.*, II, 425–26.

tribute to Shakespeare: "I am now to present your Grace [the Duke of Buckingham] with this History of *Timon*, which you were pleased to tell me you liked, and it is the more worthy of you, since it has the inimitable hand of *Shakespeare* in it, which never made more masterly strokes than in this."

This was the first version of the tragedy. J. Drake refers to it in 1699 as one of "our best English Tragedies as our Hamlet, Macbeth . . . . Timon of Athens,"[1] and Charles Gildon, writing a year earlier, says: "This play, as publish'd first by our Author, was not divided into Acts, but has been reviv'd with alterations, by Mr. Shadwell, and for a few years past, as often acted at the Theatre Royal, as any Tragedy I know."[2] Perhaps Shadwell's most striking change was in giving Timon two mistresses. Genest's synopses of the play show how wide were his deviations. Act I "begins with a soliloquy by a new character called Demetrius" and "concludes with a scene between Timon and Evandra, in which he professes a regard for her on account of former favours, but says he is so much in love with Melissa that he cannot live happily without her."[3] In the second act we see Melissa with her maid Chloe, and in the act following "Melissa having heard of Timon's distresses, orders her servants not to admit him."[4] But Timon finds that in his reverses "Evandra consoles him."[5] In the fourth act Melissa, who has, meanwhile, sworn her love to Alcibiades, hears that Timon has discovered gold. She searches him out, but he drives her away, asserting his love for Evandra. The fifth act is totally changed. After a scene between Timon and Evandra near the cave, Alcibiades enters to find that Timon is dead and that Evandra has stabbed herself. Melissa then strives to restore herself in the graces of Alcibiades, but is repulsed. The Senators, with halters about their necks, are harangued by Alcibiades. The play ends as all lament the deaths of Timon and Evandra. In this version Thomas Betterton played Timon.

[1] *The Shakespeare Allusion Book*, II, 425–26.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, 421.

[3] *Some Account of the English Stage*, I, 248–49.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 249.

[5] *Ibid.*

The epilogue of *The Jew of Venice*[1] by George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, implies that the play was unsuccessful, but Downes in *Roscius Anglicanus* praises it: "Timon of Athens, alter'd by Mr. Shadwell; 'twas very well acted, and the music in't well performed; it wonderfully pleased the Court and City; being an excellent moral."[2] And, in fact, the stage history of this version leaves no doubt as to its success. As Genest says, it was "continued on the acting list for many years."[3] The first revival occurred at the Haymarket Theater on June 27, 1707.[4] Mills played Timon, Verbruggen Apemantus, and Booth Alcibiades. The parts of Evandra and Melissa were played, respectively, by Mrs. Porter and Mrs. Bradshaw. On December 8, 1720,[5] the play was put on at Drury Lane with Booth as Timon and Mills as Apemantus, and on May 1, 1733,[6] it was acted at Covent Garden with Milward as Timon and Quin as Apemantus. Walker played Alcibiades. Drury Lane offered the play again on March 20, 1740,[7] for the benefit of Milward, who again played Timon. Finally, it was seen five years later at Covent Garden, on April 20, 1745,[8] with Hale presumably in the title rôle.[9]

The next version of *Timon of Athens* proved to be a composite of both Shadwell and Shakespeare, arranged by James Love (James Dance) and published in 1768. It was acted at Richmond, and, according to *Biographia Dramatica*, "well received."[10] Aikin played Timon and Love himself Apemantus. Alcibiades was acted by Cautherly. In the first act one of Shadwell's songs was sung. Shadwell's Melissa was omitted but was frequently mentioned. In the second act the dunning scene was omitted, and the act ended with the first two scenes of Shakespeare's third act. In the fourth act Evandra spoke lines usually pronounced by Flavius

[1] The lines run: "How was the Scene forlorn, and how despis'd,
When Timon without Musick moraliz'd."

[2] *Roscius Anglicanus, or, An Historical Review of the Stage* (1789), p. 47.

[3] *Some Account of the English Stage*, I, 251.

[4] *Ibid.*, II, 373. [6] *Ibid.*, III, 394. [8] *Ibid.*, IV, 164.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 46. [7] *Ibid.*, III, 609.

[9] On February 6, 1711, a version of *Timon of Athens* was acted at the Charity School, Clerkenwell, under the direction of John Honeycott, the headmaster. For this offense Honeycott was publicly rebuked by the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge. See *Notes and Queries* (7th Series), III, 46.

[10] IV, 339.

in the last act (V, i, 119–22; 129–133; 216). This act began with a soliloquy by Timon based on an earlier scene between him and Apemantus (IV, iii, 197–397).

Richard Cumberland, leader of the school of Sentimental Drama, offered on December 4, 1771, at Drury Lane Theater, a typically eighteenth-century version of *Timon of Athens*. This adaptation has been fully discussed elsewhere.[1] It is suggestive to recall the comment of Horace Walpole that Cumberland had "caught the manners and diction of the original so exactly" that it was "full as bad a play as it was before he corrected it."[2] The extraordinary changes in Cumberland's version include: the complete mutilation of the banquet scene; the omission of Apemantus' part; and the creation of a daughter with whom Alcibiades falls in love. In the second act Lucius makes love to Evanthe, the daughter of Timon, but is interrupted by Lucullus. This act is appreciably shortened. In the fourth act no courtezans nor banditti appear—concessions to the polite taste of the age! In the last act still more radical changes occur: Evanthe intercedes for the citizens; the treasure found in the woods by Timon proves to have been deposited there by Lucullus; Alcibiades' soldiers pillage Lucius' house, etc. Indeed, as Doran points out, Timon has "more of Cumberland and less of Shakespeare than the public could welcome."[3]

Still another adaptation of *Timon of Athens* was produced at Covent Garden Theater on May 13, 1786, by Thomas Hull. Holman played Timon, Wroughton Apemantus, and Farren Alcibiades. Hull acted the part of Flavius and Quick that of Lucullus. "Quick and Wewitza (Lucius) played well," says Genest, "and did not make their parts too comic."[4] The *European Magazine* for May, 1786, approves the interpretation of Evandra, but adds: "We cannot say the same of Mr. Hull's alteration, which ought to be consigned to oblivion."

With the close of the age of alterations *Timon of Athens* began to come into its own. Through the aid of elaborate scenic devices

[1] See S. T. Williams, *Richard Cumberland* (1917), pp. 88–91.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

[3] *History of the Stage*, II, 68.

[4] *Some Account of the English Stage*, VI, 402.

the original play achieved some success upon the stage. The first of these revivals of Shakespeare's play took place at Drury Lane on October 28, 1816. Genest quotes the advertisement of Lamb, the adapter: "The Hon. George Lamb, in the advertisement prefixed to the play acted on this evening says—'the present attempt has been to restore Shakespeare on the stage, with no other omissions than such as the refinement of manners has rendered necessary—the short interpolation in the last scene has been chiefly compiled from Cumberland's alteration.' Lamb alludes chiefly to the characters of the courtezans—but much is omitted in the dialogue, and generally with propriety."[1] The main changes of Lamb were textual; the play as a whole adhered to the original.

But the fame and distinction of this version of *Timon of Athens* was due, above all else, to the fact that Edmund Kean played the part of Timon. In a long review of the play the *European Magazine* for November, 1816, points out how exactly Kean was suited to the rôle. Likewise the *New Monthly Magazine* for December, 1816, praises this memorable performance:

October 28th the Tragedy of *Timon of Athens* was performed after a long absence from the stage. Whoever has read this piece will coincide in the opinion attributed to the late Mr. Sheridan, that it is calculated for the closet only, and cannot produce a great effect in representation. Mr. Kean of course personated the principal character, upon which the whole interest of the play depends. It is certainly one of those parts in which his peculiarity of manner, his rapid transition of countenance, and the harshness of his voice, are employed to great advantage; but such is the nature of the piece, that till the conclusion of the third act he had very little opportunity of distinguishing himself. Here his energy, however, compensated, in a great measure, for the flatness of the preceding scenes. When he called on his persecutors to "cut out his heart in sums" to "tell out his blood" in the liquidation of their demands, his eyes flashed fire, his frame seemed convulsed with passion, and his utterance choked with the violence of his rage. His parting exclamation, "Here, tear me, take me, and the gods fall on you!" was accompanied with the hurried action and horrible tone of fury and despair. In the succeeding scene the determination of Timon to invite his flatterers to a banquet, as deceitful as their promises, was finely rendered. The momentary pause before the idea was matured, the rapidity with which he directed his steward to write his friends once more, and the exultation

[1] *Ibid.*, VIII, 584. For an account of Lamb's version on the German stage see *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXVIII, 224.

with which, in the anticipation of their disappointment, he exclaimed, "I'll once more feast the rascals," produced an electrical effect upon the audience. We did not think him equally happy in the delivery of the grace in the mock-banquet scene, but the imprecations which follow were given with terrifying force. In the three last scenes with Alcibiades, Apemantus and the Senators, which, though differing in words are nearly similar in effect, Kean acquitted himself admirably. Bengough's personation of Apemantus was far above mediocrity. Wallack as Alcibiades, and Holland as Flavius, were very successful. The tragedy has been got up in splendid style; the banquet scene in particular is superb, and the incidental music by Cooke, deserved the warm commendation which it received. These advantages, combined with Kean's extraordinary powers, procured for the piece a most favourable reception and frequent repetition.

No better proof exists that Timon possesses a certain unique power upon the stage than these testimonies concerning Kean's greatness in the rôle. B. W. Procter, in his *Life of Edmund Kean*, says that "Kean, as was to be expected, gave all the dialogue in the latter part of the play with prodigious effect: his retorts upon Apemantus, and his curses upon ungrateful Athens . . . . were made as fierce as voice and expression could render them."[1] Oulton, also, in his *History of the Theater*, praises this production.[2] But the two most vivid records of Kean as Timon are found in F. W. Hawkins' *Life of Edmund Kean*.[3] The second description is from the pen of Leigh Hunt:

The sustained force of his Shylock, and the caustic vigour of his Richard might have been accepted as a reliable presage of the excellence with which he embodied the Timon of Shakespeare. His acting throughout was deep in feeling, intense, varied, and powerful. The earlier dialogues passed off with a degree of languor from which the finest acting could not redeem them; but as the play advanced, admiration of Kean's talent excited a deep solicitude; and the energy with which he gave the execrations of Timon, the intense thought which he infused into every word of his parting address to Athens, his altercation with the rugged and philosophical Apemantus, and his encouragement of the thieves in their warfare upon mankind, were unexceptionably admirable. His burst of impatience, "Give me breath," and the manner in which he reprobated the guests at the empty feast, were electrical; and nothing could have been more beautiful, or in closer conformity with the spirit of the part, than the grim and savage fury which possessed him throughout his different encounters with those who disturbed his solitude in the woods. Mr. Harry Stoe Van Dyk writes in an

[1] P. 179. [2] I, 345. [3] I, 396–99.

unpublished letter that Kean breathed the very soul of melancholy and tenderness in those impressive words:

> "But myself, who had the world as my confectionary;
> The mouths, the tongues, the eyes and hearts of men
> At duty, more than I could frame employment;
> That numberless upon me stuck, as leaves
> Do on the oak, have, with one winter's brush,
> Fell from their boughs and left me open, bare
> For every storm that blows" (IV, iii, 259–66).

"The finest scene in the whole performance," writes Leigh Hunt, "was the one with Alcibiades. We never remember the force of contrast to have been more truly pathetic. Timon, digging in the woods with his spade, hears the approach of military music; he starts, waits its approach silently, and at last in comes the gallant Alcibiades with a train of splendid soldiery. Never was scene more effectively managed. First you heard a sprightly quick march playing in the distance. Kean started, listened, and leaned in a fixed and angry manner on his spade, with frowning eyes and lips full of the truest feeling, compressed but not too much so; he seemed as if resolved not to be deceived, even by the charm of a thing inanimate;—the audience were silent; the march threw forth its gallant notes nearer and nearer, the Athenian standards appear, then the soldiers come treading on the scene with that air of confident progress which is produced by the accompaniment of music; and at last, while the squalid misanthrope still maintains his posture and keeps his back to the strangers, in steps the young and victorious Alcibiades, in the flush of victorious expectation. It is the encounter of hope and despair."

Such comment concerning an almost forgotten stage history is especially valuable since the play has been generally neglected by the ordinary theatrical criticism of the day. Francis Gentleman, in *The Dramatic Censor*,[1] does not devote space to *Timon*, and, most unluckily, Hazlitt's famous body of Shakespearean criticism contributes nothing to the stage history of the tragedy. In 1840 Macready examined the play, with a view to producing it, but contented himself with writing in his *Diary* that it was "only an incident with comments on it."[2] In 1851 Samuel Phelps brought it forward, magnificently staged: "On the 15th September [Phelps] produced with great splendour Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, and again made a tremendous effect on play-goers generally in the character of Timon. Old habitués and the critics who remembered

[1] Francis Gentleman, *The Dramatic Censor* (1770).

[2] *The Diaries of William Charles Macready*, II (1833–51), 65.

Edmund Kean in this character all said Phelps surpassed him."[1] Phelps had a strong supporting company: George Bennett's Apemantus was a worthy companion portrait; Marston this time played Alcibiades (on its next production Apemantus) and the whole strength of the fine working company was engaged in the piece. Timon was played some forty nights between the first production and Christmas.[2]

A few newspaper criticisms of the performance are quoted in the *Life of Samuel Phelps*.[3] Details of this production especially noted were the "Greek interiors," the "classical landscapes," and the final scene at the tomb of Timon. Of the oratory, in particular, "the curse at the end of the third act . . . . brought down the curtain with a tumult of applause." Mr. Marston's Apemantus was of the greatest service to the effectiveness of the scene: "With a countenance deformed by malignity, and abject deportment, a sharp spiteful glance, and a hard-hitting delivery of the pointed language, this personage was a most admirable type of the worst species of the cynic breed."[4]

Phelps revived his production at Sadler's Wells on October 11, 1856, with new "rich garments and costly materials," and "the scenery being new painted."[5] Marston played Apemantus, Rae Flavius, and Rayner Alcibiades. A review of the piece appeared in the *Morning Advertiser:* The "scenery," says the critic, is "not only archaeologically correct, but picturesquely beautiful; and the diorama that shows the attack on Athens by Alcibiades, and the march of his army, is a masterpiece of effect and contrivance. . . . . The applause burst out in spontaneous volleys."[6]

Reference has been found (*The Athenaeum*, May 28, 1904) to a performance of *Timon of Athens*, under the direction of Charles Calvert, the actor-manager, at Manchester, about 1864. But apparently no official record of such a performance has survived.

[1] W. M. Phelps and J. Forbes-Robertson, *Life of Samuel Phelps*, p. 121.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 222–24.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 222. "As Apemantus in 'Timon of Athens' Henry Marston gave the biting retorts of the misanthropic philosopher with unforced point and excellent effect" (John Westland Marston, *Our Recent Actors*, II, 53–54).

[5] W. M. Phelps and J. Forbes-Robertson, *Life of Samuel Phelps*, p. 152.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 152. Professor Morley in *The Diary of a London Playgoer*, p. 154, says that "Timon of Athens is wholly a *poem* to the Sadler's Wells audience."

The next acting of the play which has left us a definite history is that sponsored by F. R. Benson, the actor-manager, at the Shakespeare Festival at Stratford-on-Avon, in 1892. Shakespearean revivals began on Monday, April 18, and concluded with three performances of *Timon of Athens*, one on Friday, April 22, and two on the poet's birthday. *The Academy* of April 16, 1892, has the following notice:

> The annual series of memorial performances at Stratford-on-Avon, which have again this year, for the fifth time, been undertaken by Mr. F. R. Benson, will consist of eight representations of Shakespeare's plays, including a revival of "Timon of Athens" a tragedy that has not been seen on the boards since Phelps produced it at Sadler's Wells about twenty-five years ago.

The version was compressed into three acts, and Benson himself played the part of Timon. The following account of an eye witness is of interest:

> Mr. Mollison gave a good Apemantus, and Mr. Swete a respectable, but heavy, and rather too melting Flavius. But there is really only one "part" in "Timon of Athens" and that was played by Mr. Benson and played well. The change from the graceful and gracious lord to the bitter and broken misanthrope was skilfully worked out. The five acts were thrown into three, to hasten the action, and the scenery was pretty if not always true to reality. The music was necessarily incongruous. But though giving much credit to Mr. Benson for his representation, we became more than ever convinced that this one man play, without lovers and love scenes, without plot or counterplot, would never be a popular one for the public and mercenary stage. We are glad to have seen it, for we think we learn something more of Shakespeare's mind and art in every representation of his works; but it leaves us sad. Lord Timon's "feast" made a picturesque and classic picture, and the "masque of ladies" was only too congruous with modern taste. The mock feast was less studied; and the long and dragging scene in the woods where visitor after visitor arrive and depart, became rather monotonous. The termination was varied at each representation. On Friday Timon was found dead by his friends and the speechifying was at his side. On Saturday, the reading of his gravestone was among his friends in another scene; and the death scene was only a momentary tableau, a finer effect, a solitary ending to the solitary man.[1]

[1] *Poet Lore*, IV, 374–75. In a recent letter to the present writer (June 8, 1919) Mr. Benson says of this production: "The points we laid stress on were: Banquets, dancing girls, flutes, wine, colour, and form. Then comes the contrast of the sour misery, the embittered wisdom, the impotent rage against the false gods and the end of the man who yearned for truth and wisdom and love. . . . . I love the play and the part. I take it that it is somewhat of a preliminary study for Lear, approached from a different angle."

Timon was acted again in London on May 18, 1904, at the Court Theater. The *London Times* of May 19 notes that the play achieved a run of some ten nights: "Last night Mr. J. H. Leigh added Timon of Athens to his choice little record of Shakespearean revivals. This rather quaint play, which has not been seen in London since Phelps produced it at Sadler's Wells half a century ago, is acted with zeal and intelligence by every member of the Court company. There is of course no 'female interest' in the play, and even the ladies Timandra and Phrynia, 'mistresses to Alcibiades,' have been on this occasion virtually reduced to dumb-show; but there is a lovely ballet, and a Cupid who might have strayed out of Offenbach's *Belle Helène*. Altogether it is what Jim Pinkerton would call an 'olio of attractions.'" The *Athenaeum* of May 28, 1904, states that this adaptation was based upon Benson's version of 1892.

The Timon story had currency also in Germany. Beginning in 1778[1] adaptations of Shakespeare's tragedy began to appear. Many of these were so free as to retain few traces of the original, but one or two adhere scrupulously to Shakespeare. Many of these versions have survived, and all of them are interesting examples of the remarkable stage history of the play.

Study of such important dramatic histories as Cohn's *Shakespeare in Germany* or Creizenach's *Englische Comödianten* fails to show that the English players acted *Timon* in Germany. Nevertheless, the revival of interest in *Timon* as a dramatic theme occurred before the English Shadwell's renaissance of the play, for in 1671, at Thorn, was brought out *Timon, oder der Missbrauch des Reichtums*.[2] This play, however, is rather a version of Lucian's Dialogue than of Shakespeare's play. Apparently the earliest known version of Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* adapted for the German stage appeared about a century later, offered by the *K. K. Censur-Actuarius*, F. J. Fischer. Genée notes: "1778. Timon von Athen, ein Schauspiel in dreyen Aufzügen. (Schauspiel von Shakespeare. Fürs Prager Theater adaptirt von F. J. Fischer.) Prag 1778."[3] Fischer curtailed the play, blending the second and third acts into one and

[1] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXI, 86.
[2] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 86, note.
[3] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 86.

eliminating other passages until only three acts remained. So far as known this version was never acted.

The interest shown in reviving Shakespeare by such men as Schroeder of Hamburg and Dalberg of Mannheim[1] made it inevitable that *Timon of Athens* should receive attention as an acting play. Thus we find that Schiller himself is concerned about its production. In connection with his study of the stage he writes: "Unsere Schaubühne hat noch eine grosse Eroberung ausstehen, von deren Wichtigkeit erst der Erfolg sprechen wird. Shakespeare's 'Timon von Athen' ist, soweit ich mich besinnen kann, noch auf keiner deutschen Bühne erschienen; und so gewiss ich den Menschen vor allem Andern zuerst in Shakespeare aufsuche, so gewiss weiss ich im ganzen Shakespeare kein Stück, wo er wahrhafter vor mir stände, wo er lauter und beredter zu meinem Herzen spräche, wo ich mehr Lebenswahrheit lernte als im 'Timon von Athen.' Es ist wahres Verdienst um die Kunst, dieser Goldader nachzugraben."[2] More than this, Schiller, in a letter to Dalberg of August 24, 1784, expressed the intention, never fulfilled, of himself adapting *Timon*.[3]

Dalberg, the famous stage manager, had the honor of first producing Shakespeare's play in Germany, or at least a version of it on the stage. *Timon of Athens*, adapted by Dalberg, was acted at Mannheim on March 22, 1789. This adaptation was far from being conservative: Timon is the lover of Timandra and the murderer of Sempronius—changes hardly acceptable, I believe, to those interested today in the problem of *Timon of Athens*. Nevertheless, these changes accomplish one result, namely the motivation of Alcibiades' speech before the Senate! The play was a lawless version of Shakespeare, was badly produced, and was acted only twice. But this failure pointed the way to other and better productions of *Timon*.[4]

In all probability the next version of *Timon of Athens* acted on the German stage was that of Albert Lindner, which appeared at

[1] *Ibid.*, XXV, 25–36.

[2] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 85.

[3] *Ibid.*, XXV, 25, and XXI, 86.

[4] The part of Timon was played by Böck; the rôles of Flavius, Apemantus, and Alcibiades were acted respectively by Beil, Iffland, and Beck. See *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXI, 89.

Berlin on April 29, 1871.[1] The manuscript reads: "Timon von Athen. Trauerspiel in 5 Akten von Wilkins und Shakespeare. Für die neuere Bühne übersetzt und in 4 Akten bearbeitet von Dr. Albert Lindner."[2] The original was daringly altered by this adapter. New characters are introduced, notably the Senators, Antiphon, Periander, Thrasyllus, and Agathon, and Timon's servants Cleon, Lichas, and Nessus. The courtezans are dispensed with; instead the reader is entertained with the loves of Alcibiades and Aspasia. There are many changes in phraseology and incident: the fool is no more; songs are introduced; and the banquet scene is expanded.

Interest in *Timon of Athens* had evidently been aroused, but it is only necessary to compare its record with that of other Shakespearean plays in Germany to discover its failure to secure a definite hold upon the stage. Between 1876 and 1892 the *Merchant of Venice* was performed approximately one thousand times; during this period *Timon of Athens* was, apparently, not acted a single night.[3] The next appearance of the tragedy was on November 12, 1892, at the Hof-und-National Theater in Munich,[4] when it was adapted for the stage by Heinrich Bulthaupt. This play is the freest of all the free versions of *Timon.* The dramatis personae are almost unrecognizable. The play begins with a scene between the housekeeper, Lesbia, and Timon's daughter, Klytia, and includes episodes between Klytia and her husband Glaukon, Alcibiades and an Athenian named Klinias, Alcibiades and the daughter of Timon. Timon is thus provided by Bulthaupt with both a daughter and a son-in-law.

[1] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXI, 89. A free adaptation of *Timon of Athens*, in a collection of Shakespeare's tragedies, made by Meyer, may have been acted about 1825, but it is unlikely that such was the case. Another stage arrangement of the play was made by Feodor Wehl, the editor of *Die Deutsche Schaubühne*, in 1862. This alteration followed the original with consistency except for the deletion of the Senate scene. In its place is substituted, at the beginning of the fourth act, another scene designed to motivate more effectively the relations between Timon and Alcibiades. It is possible that this version was never acted, but the following notice seems to indicate its appearance on the stage: "1863 Leipzig . . . . nach der Schlegel Tieck'schen Uebers. bearb. von F. Wehl." See *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXV, 25, note, and XXXI, 103. Timon was apparently played by Hanisch. It is probable that a version written by August Fresenius was neither acted nor printed. See *ibid.*, XXXI, 82 ff.

[2] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 89. For a complete account of the theory of Wilkins' share in the composition of *Timon of Athens* see the article by Delius, *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, II, 335–61.

[3] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft;* see *Statistischer Ueberblick*, in XII–XXVIII.

[4] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 106.

Ventidius is replaced by a character called Menander. More significant changes are the greater emphasis placed upon the Alcibiades theme, the compression of Shakespeare's second and third acts into one, and the development of the banquet scene. After Timon's ruin Glaukon remains alone with Timon. The latter laments that the bridegroom must take Klytia dowerless. But this Glaukon does not intend to do; he renounces the marriage. In the ensuing quarrel Klytia enters, and weeps at the feet of her disloyal lover. Glaukon persists in his refusal, is struck down by a golden candlestick in the hand of Timon, and dies in the arms of Klytia! It is difficult to conceive of a more ironical travesty upon the ancient and venerable story of Lucian and Shakespeare.

Nevertheless, the public preferred Timon, the murderer, to Timon, the misanthrope. Bulthaupt's play enjoyed a success unknown to earlier versions. The critics were dubious, but Fresenius says that he himself heard the audience call repeatedly for the author.[1] Its popularity as an acting play in the nineties is attested by the following somewhat incomplete list of performances throughout Germany: 1894, twenty performances on six different stages (Berlin, four; Bremen, four; Cassel, three; Düsseldorf, three; Oldenburg, three; Schwerin, three); 1895, six performances on three different stages (Braunschweig, two; Breslau, two; Stuttgart, two); 1896, seven performances on four different stages (Braunschweig, one; Lübeck, three; Prag, two; Stuttgart, one.)[2]

It is easy to suggest the similarity of attitude of English and German dramatists toward Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*. It offered, obviously, material for the scissors and the amending pen. The English interest in the experimentation focused in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the German in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. And in both countries, when revision was most absurd, occurred the inevitable reaction to the noble original. In England there appeared Kean's and Phelps's nineteenth-century productions, and in Germany the production at Munich,

[1] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 116. See also *ibid.*, XXIX, 110–47.

[2] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 433–38. The freedom of Bulthaupt's version is evidenced in the following notice of the performance of the play: "Timon von Athen, mit freier Benutzung der Shakespeare zugeschriebenen Dichtung von Heinrich Bulthaupt" (*ibid.*, XLIX, 122–36, and XLV, 138). Two performances of *Timon of Athens*, presumably of this version, occurred at Zürich in 1899 (*ibid.*, XXXVI, 347).

September 19, 1910, in the new Shakespeare theater. In Germany, after Bulthaupt's presentation of Timon as a domestic thug, it became clear that the many variations of the Timon story led nowhere. Fresenius says: "Das Original überragt sie alle bei weitem. Es dürfte sich deshalb schon der Mühe verlohnen, der ursprünglichen Dichtung, nur mit allernotwendigsten Kürzungen und Änderungen, noch ein weiteres Mal auf die Bühne zu verhelfen. Man wage den Versuch."[1] And Frenzel, thinking of Lindner's version, says: "Wozu überhaupt diese Bearbeitungen? Mit einem Strich durch die Reden Timons wider Timandra und Phrynia kann man ohne den geringsten Anstoss das Stück überall darstellen."[2] The revival at Munich followed the original as much as possible in a version of three acts given without interruptions. The basis of the text was Paul Heyse's translation.[3] As in Phelps's revivals, the stage settings were elaborate and were founded upon a careful study of the text. The last act of the tragedy, for example, was pronounced against a background of Greek landscape, with glimpses in the distance of the city crowned by the Acropolis.

England, the country of Shakespeare's birth, and Germany, the country which professes to have discovered him, naturally witnessed more performances of *Timon of Athens* than other lands. But, comparatively obscure as the play is, it has influenced other dramatic literatures. For many years Shakespeare's footing upon the French stage was insecure. Evidently the more accepted plays had first place; nevertheless, versions of *Timon*, or plays distinctly affected by the Timon story were acted. Brécourt's *Timon*, performed first August 13, 1684, was based upon Lucian, and probably owed nothing to Shakespeare.[4] F. W. Hawkins, in his *Annals of the French Stage* speaks of the piece as an "undramatic dramatization of Lucian's dialogue," but says that it "was represented seventeen times."[5] In all probability Brécourt's other play upon this subject, *Les Flatteurs trompés ou l'ennemi des faux amis*, is connected in no

[1] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXI, 82–135, and XLIX, 127.

[2] *Ibid.*, XLIX, 127.

[3] *Ibid.*, XXXI, 122.

[4] *Dictionnaire Dramatique*, III, 276. See also *Anecdotes Dramatiques*, II, 226–27, and *Dictionnaire des Théâtres de Paris*, V (1756), 465.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 155.

way with the English dramatist. Both plays, however, attest French recognition of Timon as a dramatic subject, as does another version of the story which appeared some years later: "*Timon le Misanthrope*, comédie en trois actes, en prose, avec des divertissements, par Delisle, aux Italiens, 1722."[1] The original theme was much embellished by Delisle.

Certainly by the last half of the eighteenth century Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* must have become familiar to French students of the drama, for between 1746 and 1749 Pierre de la Place translated the play,[2] while Pierre Letourneur's rendering was made between 1776 and 1782.[3] "Petitot thought," says Jusserand in *Shakespeare in France*, "(but wrongly) that he had discovered an imitation of Timon in Le Dissapateur by Destouches."[4] The first French play strongly influenced by Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* seems to have been that written by Louis-Sebastian Mercier, another translator of Shakespeare, during the Revolution, in 1794: "Timon d'Athenes, en cinq actes et en prose, imitation de Shakespeare, Paris 'an iii.'"[5] In this version Timon usurps a unique function. He becomes a mouthpiece for the political unrest of the age. The Preface includes a diatribe against Robespierre, and all of Timon's misanthropy has a political twist. The author's purpose is made clear in the Preface: "Timon d'Athenes était surnommé le haïsseur des hommes. Ah! si quelqu'un avait le droit affreux de les haïr, ce serait peut-être celui qui aurait vecú en France depuis dix-huit mois, au milieu de tant de scénes de démence at de fureurs. L'histoire en est si effroyable que si l'on ne se hâte d'en rassembler les témoignages, on la prendra dans deux ans pour un roman calomnieux de la nature humaine. Des hommes de sang et de ténèbres au nom de la Republique une et indivisible ont metamorphosé la sainte colère d'un grand peuple en véritable canabalisme, ont corrumpu tout à la fois, la politique, les lois, la langue et la morale."[6] In the banquet scene

[1] *Dictionnaire des Théâtres de Paris*, V, 465–66.

[2] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXVIII, 111–17.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Pp. 238–39, note.

[5] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXVIII, 111. See also J. J. Jusserand, *Shakespeare in France*, p. 439, note.

[6] Preface, p. ii. See also *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXVIII, 113.

and in the last interview with the Senators before his cave Timon's anathemas against Athens are really directed against France. In the latter scene he cries out:

> Oui, je suis malade de dégout, du dégout de ce monde d'ou vous avez banni le régne de la justice, des moeurs et des lois . . . . Vos lois politiques, vos lois civiles, toutes ne sont elles pas cruelles? . . . . Eh! que ne feront point le crime insolent et l'audace effrenée, lorsqu'ils seront assurés del'impunité? Dieux! dans ces épouvantables jours, donnez du moins une marque de votre puissance; l'homme n'est plus fait à votre image.[1]

This is not Timon speaking, but rather Mercier fresh from the scenes of the Revolution.

In form Mercier's play is very like Shakespeare's. It is shortened, but the leading characters are retained, though some names are changed, notably Lucides for Lucius, Semphronidé for Sempronius, and Lucullimé for Lucullus. The painter is called Pictomane, and the poet Spondeas. The play was very probably acted, though I have found no positive record of performance.

One is inclined to suspect that Molière's famous misanthrope was influenced by Shakespeare's play, especially when one finds such a device as Coquelin has pointed out as occurring in both, namely the repast of hot water, an incident which also occurs in *L'Auvergnat* of Labille. Certainly the influence, though not clearly traced, has persisted, for a dramatic historian's account of *La Ciguë*, acted at the Odéon on May 20, 1844, describes this piece as a spirited comedy "qui rapelle pour le fond, le *Timon d'Athenes* de Shakespeare, et pour la forme, la manière grecque d'Andre Chenier."[2]

It is almost unthinkable, so widely has Shakespeare been translated, read, and acted, that *Timon of Athens*, in some form, has not been performed in practically all European countries. There have been, for example, adaptations of the play in the United States and in Japan. *Timon of Athens*, arranged for the stage by N. H. Bannister, was first acted in New York at the little boxlike Franklin Theater on April 8, 1839.[3] An American revival of the play of con-

[1] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, XXXVIII, 113.

[2] Paul Porel et Georges Monval, *L'Odéon*, II (1882), 232.

[3] T. A. Browne, *A History of the New York Stage*, I, 260. Richard Mansfield considered seriously bringing forward a production of *Timon of Athens* "In the search for new characters the Shakespearean gallery was continually under scrutiny. Timon of Athens, Falstaff, and King John were often on the verge of production." Cf. Paul Wilstach, *Richard Mansfield*, p. 417.

siderable importance was that of Mr. Frederick Warde, when on tour in 1910.[1] The version was free, the most notable change being that of the final episode. The play ends with a procession of soldiers and citizenry following Timon's body as it is borne along in lamentation. The piece was elaborately staged, and there was introduced a pantomime, called *The Senses*, together with a Greek dance. This version of *Timon of Athens* was acted more than a dozen times in various American cities of the South and West, and it achieved appreciable success.

The Japanese play founded upon Shakespeare's *Timon* was acted about 1914. The adaptation was made by Koshu Kojima for the Shintomiza Theater of Tokio. *Romeo and Juliet*, known in Japan as the *Riddle of the Heart Threads Solved*, and *The Merchant of Venice*, entitled *Law-Suit with Human Flesh as a Pledge*, had been popular plays. Similarly *Timon of Athens*, called *The Sound of the Bell*, was successful. The tragedy has many additions and changes, but various incidents such as the scene in the garden of the Viscount Hozumi, the Japanese Timon, with his flattering friends, show clearly the influence of Shakespeare.[2]

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

YALE UNIVERSITY

[1] Accounts of Mr. Warde's performances of *Timon of Athens* are accessible in records of the stage and prompt-books, now in the possession of Mr. Warde. Mr. Warde informed the present writer that he once acted the part of Flaminius in an English production of *Timon* at Manchester. He says that Richard Mansfield told him that *Timon of Athens* was "worthless for stage presentation."

[2] *The Nation*, CIII, 90 (July 27, 1916).

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

A Register of Middle English Didactic and Religious Verse. By Carleton Brown, Professor of English in the University of Minnesota. Part II: *Index of First Lines and Index of Subjects and Titles.* Oxford. Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, 1920. Quarto. Pp. xx+458.

Much earlier than might have been expected in these troublous years Professor Brown has given us the second and final volume of his *Register of Middle English Verse.* Of the usefulness of these volumes to the investigator of the literature, the religious thought, or the social ideals of England in the Middle Ages it is impossible to speak too highly. No worker who has ever examined them will willingly be without a copy. Professor Brown has by his indefatigable industry and his almost inhuman accuracy and range of knowledge added days to our lives. Additions and corrections will of course be made to his work from time to time, but the additions will be few and the corrections fewer, and the fine paper and ample margins of the volumes will enable their fortunate owners to record all the additions and corrections that are likely ever to be made.

In the Afterword of the present volume Professor Brown devotes a few pages to a discussion of the comparative popularity of Middle English religious and secular poems, as indicated by the number of manuscripts of each. He points out that the judgments of our own day are not trustworthy criteria of the popularity or importance of a literary production in its own day and that the most trustworthy evidence upon these points is the circulation it enjoyed, as indicated by the number of extant or known copies of it.

This is a fact of no little importance, and Professor Brown has done well to emphasize it as he has. It has been argued, for example, that after writing his translation

> of the Wrecched Engendryng of Mankinde
> As men may in Pope Innocent yfynde,

Chaucer destroyed it because of its unattractive subject-matter. Whatever may have been the fate of Chaucer's translation, it cannot safely be argued that the subject would not have appealed to him or to his contemporaries. Many manuscripts of the original treatise have come down to us; it was translated into French by Eustache Deschamps; was frequently reprinted by the early printers; and two translations of it into English were published in 1576—one by George Gascoigne, the other (republished in 1580 and 1586) by H. Kerton.

Discussion of Chaucer's attitude toward his "Tale of Melibeus" ought also to take into consideration the vogue of Albertano's treatise in the Middle Ages. The truth is that the success of a book—like that of a jest—lies, not in its absolute quality, but in its adaptation to its audience, and that the judgments of literary critics are valueless in determining the probable appeal of a piece of writing to persons of another age or of other interests than their own.

Another point upon which information would doubtless be welcomed by students of medieval English culture is the class of society for which the extant manuscripts of religious and secular literature were produced. Some of us, agreeing with Professor Brown that the dominating principle during the medieval period was art for instruction's sake, hold the view that until after the beginning of the fourteenth century the ruling classes of England found their literary entertainment mainly in the French language; that until then neither the secular nor the religious writing in English was intended for the upper classes; and consequently that a history of culture and taste in England must take account of the French (and Latin) literature known to have been read by medieval Englishmen as well as of the literature in English. No one is perhaps so well equipped at the present time as Professor Brown to tell us what indications the quality and form of the manuscripts give as to the classes of society for which both religious and secular literature were produced. He has voluminous notes in regard to the manuscripts, and his impressions of many of them must be fresh and clear. His views would have a value not possessed by those of an editor pronouncing on a single manuscript without a knowledge of the whole field.

J. M. M.

57

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *October 1920* NUMBER 6

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS IN HERDER'S THOUGHT. II

HERDER'S CRITICISM OF THE PRINCIPLE OF "IMITATION OF NATURE"

Under the rule of the imagination, which through the influence of the naturalistic philosophy had displaced the absolute reason of classicism, or rather pseudo-classicism, as the aesthetic faculty, Lessing concluded that modern art was no longer limited to the beauty of Greek art (wrongly regarded by him as absolute), but had gained for its range all "visible," i.e., concrete nature, of which beauty, in Boileau's sense, is only a small part. In selecting its objects of imitation from concrete nature, art must, however, use discretion. It must give preference to those objects and to those moments in the continuous sequence of events, which permit the most play to the imagination. It must choose the "pregnant" moment. Now, of all the possible moments, that of the culmination of an event is the least fitted to stimulate imagination. For whatever can be conceived as happening beyond that point must be inferior in intensity and interest.

Further, in art, a formal permanence is given to a passing moment. But no extreme stage can be regarded as enduring. De Lamettrie, who had himself portrayed as Democritus, the laughing philosopher,

would on repeated view become more and more offensive. His laugh would gradually appear as a hideous grin. Similarly, an open-mouthed Laocoon would become disgusting; so would a raging Ajax and a Medea depicted in the act of murdering her children. The poet, on the other hand, whose means or "signs" of expression are not simultaneous as those of the artist, but successive, is not bound to one moment. He can proceed successively and cumulatively.

Herder points out the confusion involved in Lessing's demand for the choice of a moment which is not transitory. The only part of nature which is not transitory is dead nature. The life, the soul, of any object is manifest in its transitoriness. In limiting art to the intransitory parts of bodies we take from it *ihren besten Ausdruck.* "Whatever living (*seelenvollen*) expression," he argues, "we may imagine in any body, is always transitory. The more the body reveals a human passion, the more it represents a variable condition of human nature." He continues to prove that Lessing's "pregnant" moment is no more enduring than his climactic moment.

> As well as I can say to a laughing Mettrie, on seeing him the third and fourth time and finding him still laughing: "Thou art a coxcomb," I can say to Myron's cow (a picture praised by Lessing): "Why doest thou keep on standing; why doest thou not go away?" For the same reason that I find a roaring Laocoon finally intolerable, I should also ultimately, if somewhat later, grow weary of a sighing Laocoon because he never stops sighing. Similarly, I should become bored with a standing Laocoon because he keeps on standing instead of sitting down; and also of a rose by Huisum (a noted painter of roses), because it keeps on blooming instead of withering.
>
> In nature everything is transitory, passion of the soul and sensation of the body, activity of the soul and motion of the body: every state of finite and variable nature.

Thus every imitation of nature must as such be unnatural and irritating because it unnaturally prolongs a transitory moment.

From this Herder concludes that the true purpose of art cannot be objective at all but must be subjective. He rejects thereby the entire theory of imitation, which is fundamentally objective.

He now proceeds to apply this new principle to poetry and art by combining with it the Aristotelean distinction between "work"

and "energy."[1] A "work" embodies a complete idea in a definitive form. In the measure in which art succeeds in being such a "work," it is enduring, *ewig*. This use of the word *ewig* in the meaning of formal perfection is common to the great German writers of the last generation of the eighteenth century.[2] It is the transcendentalistic, subjective conception of eternity. The artist is to portray not a moment in actual nature, for if literally permanent such a moment would be lifeless, but *den langen, seligen Ausdruck*, the *ewige Moment*, i.e., not an imitation of actuality but a synthesis which through its perfection prevents repeated observation from becoming tiresome and so has an abstract subjective element of permanence. The reason why the extreme moment in any action is not fitted for art is not that it is any more transitory than any other but that on repeated view it becomes empty and tiresome.

Poetry, on the other hand, and all the arts which produce their effects through the passing of moments in time, are forms of "energy" in the Aristotelean sense. These arts[3] must not, like pictorial art, aim at one complete and supreme moment which would absorb all our attention, but at an unbroken chain of actions of which each moment would be only one link and not a detached climax.

He then defines the "beautiful," which is the subject of pictorial art, as the quality which, by setting all its parts in a simultaneous harmony, makes the whole a fit object for the *ewige Anblick*.

But even this static beauty of pictorial art is, according to Herder, not an objective form as it is to Lessing, but a symbolic or characteristic expression of the nature of the human soul. It also is secondary to personality.

Physical beauty is not sufficient. For through our eyes there peers a soul, and therefore a soul must peer through the physical beauty portrayed

[1] This distinction between "work" and "energy" had been used before Herder by the English writer Harris.

[2] Cf. Goethe's

"Er kann dem Augenblick
Dauer verleihen,"

in "Das Göttliche"; also "Dauer im Wechsel." See Introduction to my edition of *Goethe's Poems*, pp. iv f.

[3] "Müssen keinen Augenblick ein Höchstes liefern, wie auch unsre Seele in dies augenblickliche Höchste verschlingen wollen, denn sonst wird eben die Annehmlichkeit gestört, die in der Folge, in der Verbindung und Abwechslung dieser Augenblicke und Handlungen beruht, und jeden Augenblick nur als ein Glied der Kette, nicht weiter, nutzt. Wird einer dieser Augenblicke, Zustände und Handlungen, eine Insel, ein abgetrenntes Höchstes, so geht das Wesen der energischen Kunst verloren."

for us. And in which state should this soul shine forth? Without doubt, in that which can sustain my view longest. And which is that? No state of idle calm which suggests nothing to me; none expressing itself in exaggerations, which would clip the wings of my imagination; but rather the motion which is, as it were, about to declare itself, the dawn of action which offers a view in both directions and thus presents in the inexhaustible wealth of its outlook, what may be called the "eternal view."[1]

PERSONALITY AT REST AND IN ACTION

The crisis of the conflict has now been reached in Herder's criticism of Lessing's application of the sensualistic theories to the techniques of poetry and art. Since, argues Lessing, the eye takes in objects simultaneously grouped in space, the "signs" of visual expression, which are the natural means of pictorial expression, as lines and colors (and values, of which Lessing and his literary contemporaries knew naught) are fit to "imitate" or represent objects only in the simultaneous spatial order. The "signs" of poetry, i.e., articulate sound, being successive,[2] can "imitate" objects only in the order of time.

Lessing illustrates these conclusions with some passages from the *Iliad* and the classical Greek tragedies, and with further conclusions drawn from the Laocoon group.

In his principal thesis Lessing states the fundamental difference between the two arts in question thus, that pictorial art "imitates" or represents one simultaneous static relation of objects in space, whereas poetry "imitates" successive objects occurring in time. The latter he calls actions. He finds this distinction borne out by two scenes in the *Iliad*, namely, the making of the bow of Pandarus and the council of the gods. He defines the former as a progressive visible action, the different parts of which occur consecutively in time; the latter as a static visible action, the different parts of which develop simultaneously (*nebeneinander*) in space. He proceeds to define "bodies" as "objects which or the parts of which coexist

[1] ". . . . Sondern die sich gleichsam ankündigende Bewegung, die uns zu beiden Seiten hinschauen lässt und also einzig und allein ewigen Ausblick gewährt." Herder has a strong, poetical predilection for the moment of dawn, in its literal as well as metaphorical sense. Dawn is the mirror of youth to his ardent, ever-young spirit.

[2] And "arbitrary," i.e., symbolic in regard to their meaning. The distinction of "natural" and "arbitrary" "signs" played a considerable part in the aesthetic theories of Dubos and Harris and others. See p. 72, footnote.

simultaneously in space"; and "actions" as "objects which or whose parts occur successively in time." This limitation of poetry to "actions" is the result of the successive nature of its signs of expression. For in order to produce the illusion, the poet must adapt his imitation of objects to the successive order of expression imposed by the nature of his medium. Lessing applies this theory to an analysis of the Homeric description of the shield of Achilles, pointing out that the classical poet cast this description in the form of an account of the making of the shield. If, he concludes from that, a poet wishes to describe, he must follow the example of Homer and turn the static object in space, of which he wishes to produce a picture in the mind of his audience, into a succession of objects in time. He severely criticizes his contemporaries, especially Haller, for having written descriptive poetry.

This distinction between the two arts is crucial, and Herder's criticism of its various elements strikes at the foundations not only of Lessing's theories but of the entire complex tradition on which they rest, and at the same time lays down the foundations of his own theories. Herder corrects Lessing's definition of action by pointing out that "the idea of succession is only a part of the idea of action. Only succession produced by a spontaneous force (*Successives durch Kraft*)[1] is action." Succession is a pure abstraction, whereas action is a concrete embodiment of a living force.[2]

Lessing, by pushing his sensualistic theories too far, confounds the sequence of verbal sounds with the associations of images and ideas, which are the true objects of poetic discourse. These ideas, while perceived by means of a succession of sounds, yet follow a principle of association independent of those sounds. This principle must be embodied in the spontaneous forces which turn succession into action. Herder calls the associative bond "coherence of imaginative ideas (*zusammenhängende Bildergriffe*).

It is therefore wrong to limit poetry to succession in time. For, though uttered in succession, it yet belongs also to space because

[1] *Kraft* to Herder meant a spontaneous principle, as will be shown later.

[2] "Ich denke nur ein in der Zeitfolge wirkendes Wesen, ich denke nur Veränderungen, die durch die Kraft einer Substanz [the Leibnitzian monad!] aufeinanderfolgen: so wird Handlung. Und sind Handlungen der Gegenstand der Dichtkunst, so wette ich, wird dieser Gegenstand nie aus dem trocknen Begriffe der Succession bestimmt werden können."

it is concrete action. Poetry thus being at home both in the spheres of time and space is the "discourse of perfect sensibility" (*sinnlich vollkommne Rede*).

Herder adds that Lessing's argument fails also because it proves too much. For if the succession of the sounds of speech determined the sequence of ideas, then prose and every form of scientific discourse would also have to forego description—which is absurd.

Herder now develops his own theory in an analysis of the Homeric accounts of the assembling of Juno's chariot by Hebe, of the making of the bow of Pandarus, and of the fashioning of the shield of Achilles by Vulcan.

The "action" of Hebe's putting together the chariot of Juno (*Iliad* E 722–31) is so detailed and gradual that by the time the last part is added the hearer has forgotten the first. If the poet had aimed at giving a picture of the chariot as a whole, i.e., if his action had served the purpose of description or imitation of an object, his method would have been unsuccessful.

Next, as to the bow of Pandarus, he says:

> If Homer, in order to depict the bow of Pandarus, has first to make us follow the hunt of the ibex from whose horns the bow is to be made; has to show us the rock where Pandarus kills his game, and how he measures the length of the horns; then takes us to the craftsman and makes us witness every detail of the manufacture of the bow—how can anyone conclude from this that Homer had intended to have the succession of the events of his narrative, as it were, coincide with the conditions of coexistence in space, by making the description of the different parts of the bow keep pace with the progress of his discourse? It is impossible to assume that Homer, unless one regards him as a bungler, intended a description of the bow.

Herder's interpretation of the story is the following: Homer is not concerned with the description of the bow as such. He tells progressive actions because he has to keep pace with the general progress of his main action. He only acquaints us with the bow of Pandarus so far as the associations awakened by the bow are essential to the progress of his story. We learn the story of the bow not to be interested in its details as such, but to gain a conception, the most vivid, concrete, forceful conception possible, of the prowess of Pandarus, the might of his arm, the strength of the bow, and the terrible possibilities of his use of it. "When Pandarus now takes the bow,

draws the string, places the arrow, releases the string—woe to Menelaus struck by an arrow from such a bow! We know!"

Homer does not intend to give a picture of a "work" but an account of an "energy"; he is not concerned with the bow as an independent object, but chiefly as an appropriate dramatic symbol of an action involving its owner and its victim.

Similarly, the putting together of the chariot of Juno by Hebe does not serve the purpose of description. Hebe, a goddess, is not put to the pains of a minutely detailed task, in order that we may have a complete, simultaneous visual picture of a lifeless object, but in order that we gain a vivid impression of the excellence, the perfection of the parts, the value, the importance symbolized by the exquisite care bestowed by Hebe, a goddess, on the conveyance worthy of the queen of the Olympians. Homer did not aim at description of an object, but at an account of a characteristic and interesting action involving beautiful and momentous personalities.

The true poetic purpose of the story of the shield of Achilles is similar. The greatest hero of the Trojan War is in need of a shield; Thetis, his mother, a goddess, begs one of Vulcan, another god. He promises, rises, goes to work. "The whole scene is part of the action of the poem, of the progress of the epic," and is in no way an instance of a manner peculiar to Homer.

> In the making, in the growth, of the shield, there lies all the power of the "energy," the continuous process determined by a living force, which is the poet's aim. In every figure which Vulcan engraves upon the shield, I admire the creative god, in every indication of the proportions and the surface I recognize the mighty shield which is to serve Achilles, and for which the reader, absorbed in the action, longs as eagerly as Thetis.

Herder continues,

> In short, I know no successions in Homer, which had to serve as artifices, as makeshifts, in the place of descriptions or static pictures. These successions are the essence of his poem, they are the body of epic action. . . . . If Homer requires a physical picture he describes it, even if it is a Thersites; he wots not of artifices, of poetic tricks or hazards; progress is the soul of his epic.

Herder's method of attack is that of individualizing essential features, which Lessing had failed to analyze. He overcomes

Lessing by proof of overgeneralization. He shows that in the discussion of the Greek idea of beauty, in the definition of the synthetic moment, which is the proper subject of pictorial art, in the definition of action as identical with succession, in the identification of the successive nature of the sounds of speech with the order of association of ideas, Lessing failed to take into account the one essential factor common to all these matters, namely, individual personality. He concludes that personality must be the essential principle of poetry and art.

He did not at this time see the full theoretic significance of his idea, which required some ten years to reach maturity. At the time of our *Wäldchen* he was still strongly under the influence of Leibnitz. In his endeavor to give his conclusion theoretic unity and the proper philosophical form of generalization, he borrowed from Leibnitz the term "force" (*Kraft*), which expresses the active element of the monad, Leibnitz' embodiment of the primary, absolute, unchangeable, and irreplaceable principle of spontaneous individuality. The fundamental importance of this conception lies in the fact that in Leibnitz' philosophy for the first time in modern thought the principle of personality is opposed to the objective absolute reason of French rationalism and the objective—and equally absolute!—nature of the British realism of Bacon and Locke as the primary fact of reality.

This principle appears in the more concrete form of *Naturwüchsigkeit* (native spontaneity), as the central idea in the thought of Bodmer and Breitinger.

This idea, far deeper and broader than the more limited conception of Rousseau, which involves rather the more primary impulses and emotions together with personifications of the inanimate forces of nature, than the complete human personality, is the particular philosophical contribution of the German mind to the thought of the eighteenth century. This is the fundamental motive in Herder's entire work. It is the more unfortunate that German systematic philosophy was for generations diverted from its most characteristic heritage by the masterfully keen, but narrow, dry, and too featureless genius of Kant, who turned the vigorous fresh current into the formalism of Cartesian rationalism, methodologically qualified by

psychological infusion drawn from Berkeley and Hume. Abandoned by Kant, this immensely fruitful idea was left to the violent and immature conceit of the Storm and Stress movement which caricatured it, and to the morbid egoism of the Romantic movement which perverted it. Even in the classical decade beginning in 1790, the rationalistic influence, as will be shown in a later chapter, frustrated many of its vital impulses.

This idea persists throughout Herder's life, forming the fundamental motive of all his important theories: That the world of all reality, as well as that of art and poetry, consists primarily of individuals, not one of which is like any other, and each of which is necessary to the whole and must preserve its essential character. This is the essence of Herder's humanism.

To return to the specific question, individual personality is the primary fact of aesthetic reality. The aim of all the arts is "truth and expressiveness" (*Wahrheit und Ausdruck*) of personality. All other facts, external objects, abstract ideas as well as the forms and techniques, are conditioned by this. "Imitation" thus loses significance as a principle and becomes a secondary form of expression. Poetry is at liberty to use either description or succession to suit its main purpose. Not description as such is wrong, but description in the wrong place and manner.[1]

Under the theory of personality there can be no absolute, universal, necessary beauty, but only relative appropriateness as an expression of a specific form of personality. Art and poetry are not interested in the representation of objects except inasmuch as they serve to characterize individuality.

This is not merely a correction and qualification of details of Lessing's doctrine, but an original and fundamentally new orientation in reality.

The chief difficulties inherent in Herder's view will be discussed in a later chapter.

It is no longer necessary henceforth to discuss Lessing's theories in detail. Herder's criticism has taken away their foundations. We shall limit ourselves to a brief summary of the remaining main

[1] See also chapter xviii of the *Wäldchen*, which contains Herder's summary of his conclusions regarding "energy" in poetry.

theses of Herder's essay, which easily reveal their significance, because they are simple applications of his fundamental idea of personality.

"GODS AND MENTAL BEINGS, PERSONIFIED ABSTRACTIONS"

Lessing, following the rationalistic logic, had assumed that the gods represented in pictorial art are personified abstractions. To the painter, "Venus is nothing except love." Poetry, on the other hand, treats gods like beings in action (*handelnde Wesen*).

Herder, in chapter xi, puts this subject also on the proper ground. The poets, he says, were the makers of mythology. Homer's gods are "heavenly individuals," which have added to them certain typical characters. They are "not," as Lessing asserts, "merely beings in action, which, in addition to their general characters, have other traits and emotions, which may according to circumstance, predominate over the former"; but "their true nature consists in those other traits and emotions, whereas their general character is only a later generalization of those individual traits. This generalization is incomplete and subordinate and is often not taken into consideration by the poets," who are interested in individuals. "If pictorial art has to give its gods typical rather than individual characters, it does not manifest thereby its essence but its mechanical limitations." Venus, for instance, is not limited to "typical" actions. She may rave and rage; she is still no abstraction of love but the goddess of love, the mother of Cupid, the woman in love, in concrete reality."

The actions of the gods as well as of human individuals reveal their characters. Therefore pictorial poetry, illustrated by Horace, is weak.[1] Poetry has more direct symbols of action than art.

In judging of the size and the appearance of gods in Homer we must consider first not general ideas but their individual characters. *Charakter ist hier über Gottheit;* i.e., individuality is here above type.

There follow in chapter xv in a discussion of translations from Homer very interesting stylistic remarks, the main significance of which from our point of view is the principle of individuality applied

[1] The chief advocate of pictorial poetry in the eighteenth century was Daniel Webb, whereas the French writer Caylus advised the artists to "imitate" passages from the classical poets.

to style. One of the most characteristic elements of Homer's style he finds in "a certain manner of repeating some principal feature that had appeared before and now serves as a means for continuing the picture and binding into unity different sections which otherwise would fall apart."[1]

Lessing overgeneralized not only in dealing with the relations between art and poetry, but even in his analysis of poetry as such. On the premise that Homer depicts progressive actions, Lessing concludes that poetry as such is limited to actions. Herder applies his method of individuation to this subject also. Part of the passage is so characteristic that it invites literal transcription: "Homer creates in narration: 'it occurred! it came into being!' Everything with him can therefore be action and must hasten on to action. That is the aim of the energy of his Muse. Marvelous, pathetic events are his world. His word of creation says: 'It came into being.'" But "Anacreon hovers between song and narrative. His story becomes a song; his little song an epic of the god of love. He can choose this turn: 'it was,' or 'I will,' or 'thou shalt'—enough if his *melos* resounds with joy and pleasure; a lofty emotion is the energy of each one of his songs." Pindar, the odic singer, has still another purpose: "A poetic picture, in which is visible everywhere, not the work of art as such but the artist: 'Behold me, singing'!"

He sums up:

> Where can there be a comparison? The total production of Homer, Anacreon, Pindar, how different! How unlike the achievement they intend! The one narrates; the whole of the event is his aim; he is the poet of the past. The other one does not intend to speak; joy itself sings through him; the complete expression of a delightful sensation is his purpose. The third speaks that we hear him; the whole of his ode is very skilful and symmetrical structure.

It is therefore wrong to regard as Lessing does the work of one poet, no matter how great, as embodying the rules of all poetry. Each type of poetry, each individual poet must be judged on the basis of particular character, gifts, and purposes.

The last part of the *Wäldchen*, beginning with chapter xxi, is devoted to the discussion of the ugly and the disgusting. The

[1] ". . . . ein gewisses Wiederkommen auf einen Hauptzug, der schon da war und jezt das Band sein soll, um das Bild weiter zu führen und die auseinander fallenden Züge zu einem Ganzen zu verknüpfen."

details do not concern us here. But the ground on which his conclusions rest is important. It is another logical application of his principle of personality. Lessing followed the rationalistic theory in regarding ugliness as an absolute formal principle expressing the negation of the classical idea of the beautiful. He analyzed the term no more than he did that of the beautiful. Herder, having subordinated formal absolute beauty to personality, proceeded likewise with that of the ugly. Ugly is that which embodies an ugly personality. Lessing, bound by the rationalistic theory that the Greeks did not portray ugliness, had been hard put to it in accounting for Thersites in the *Iliad*. His final solution, which was an evasion (but an evasion forced upon the whole pseudo-classicism, which he followed), is that ugliness might serve the purposes of humor. "Homer made Thersites ugly in order to make him ridiculous." Herder, on the other hand, proves that Homer was very much in earnest in creating Thersites. Thersites "is not a ridiculous but a malicious, snarling rascal; he has the blackest soul of all the men before Troy." He is made more contemptible by having to suffer a trouncing at the hands of Ulysses. That by taking himself seriously he now and then makes himself ridiculous is true; but this ludicrousness is only a secondary quality in him.

Lessing, as pseudo-classicists generally, was forced by his absolute formalism to derive the conception of the terrible as well as the ridiculous from the ugly. Herder calls attention to the beauty of certain forms of homeliness based on character. He also shows that the ridiculous need not be ugly. Nor is the "terrible," which Lessing defined as the "dangerously ugly," dependent on ugliness. The Homeric gods are terrible, but certainly not ugly.

The expression of specific personalities, either in a static simultaneous form in space or in a continuous progressive action in time, is the subject of all art and poetry; that is the thesis of Herder's first *Wäldchen*.

The immediate questions arising from Herder's main conclusion are whether and in what respects personality is the measure, not only of the works created by art and poetry, but also of the poet and artist, and of the public which is both audience and creative environment

of the author and his works. As to the *significance of the thing created*, Herder is most explicit. The subject of art is an individual personality. The objects and events are not primarily introduced as parts of objective reality, but as subordinate manifestations of personality. They are part of the machinery of characterization and not imitations of objects of nature. They are, as Herder saw clearly and showed in his analysis of the Homeric stories of the bow of Pandarus, the chariot of Juno, and the shield of Achilles, not primary, but symbolic in their significance.

Herder's sound sense of reality kept him from pressing the symbolic function of objective reality too far. It was left to the Romantic movement to develop this symbolic part of objectivity into a subjective monism, in order to remove all obstacles from a vision of a universal absolute force of personality, and so, by ignoring the objective relations of personality, to destroy that also.

Herder, however, was somewhat lacking in the formal sense, both in composition and in style, and his ear was not sensitive to the finest music and cadences of diction. Though in this respect far in advance of his contemporaries among the aesthetical critics and of most of the poets as well, it becomes now and then obvious that he does not make a clear distinction between the natural truth of characters portrayed and the artistic truth which produces focus in a work of art. His conception of the "energy" as a continuous expression of individualities leads him to neglect the requirements of constructive unity.

There is one aspect of this question of which Herder was at this time apparently unconscious, namely, the part of personality in a work of art treating of inanimate nature, i.e., of landscape art. Herder, at the time of the first *Wäldchen* knew nothing of landscape painting, and never had much opportunity and inclination to study it. Even the poetical aspects of external nature had not, at this time, revealed themselves to him to any significant extent. His nature-sense did not awaken until a few years later during the solitude and homesickness of his Bückeburg days. But after that time, he gave his conception of personality a remarkable extension by including in it a symbolic interpretation of nature, which in beauty,

magnificence, and penetration has not been surpassed in critical literature. This will appear in the discussion of his *Geist der Ebräischen Poesie.*

Herder has indicated his conclusions regarding *the relativity of the significance of works of art and poetry with regard to the personalities of their creators,* in his rejection of Lessing's attempt to make Homer the standard of all poetry, and in his differentiation of Homer, Anacreon, and Pindar. Individualization of each creative genius in each particular work is his critical aim. It also is his particular gift, in which he surpassed all the men of his era. Unequaled in sympathetic discernment, the rarest gift of the creative critic, Herder became the greatest and most fruitful interpreter of poetry and of the humanistic movements of history, in which a fine and profound sense of the creative personality is the chief requirement. This gift of individualization will be discussed in detail in connection with his works on folk poetry, on the forces determining the subjects and character of poetry, on translations, on genius and related subjects, and on the *Ideen* and the *Humanitätsbriefe.*

The *relations of the public to the works of art and poetry* can be discussed to better advantage in a later chapter, in which Herder's views on the influence of environment on personality are interpreted.

Another important question is that of the specific formal elements pertaining to his conception of beauty as conditioned by personality. Herder was occupied with it at the time of our *Wäldchen,* and reached interesting and important conclusions. These will be presented in a later chapter devoted to Herder's theories regarding the forces which determine personality and so control its valuation.

MARTIN SCHÜTZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTE

We regret that irregularity in the mail service and editorial oversight occasioned in the June instalment of this article the following typographical errors: p. 1, l. 16, *read* the *for* an *before* absolute; p. 2, l. 19, supply comma after *Ideen;* p. 4, l. 22, *omit* the *after* of *and read* achievement *for* achievements; p. 4, l. 29, *read* is *for* in *before* his; p. 8, footnote, *read* Stein *for* Hein *and insert "op. cit." after* Howard; p. 9, l. 1, *read* dangers *for* angers; p. 9, l. 10, *read* Holbach *for* Holboch; p. 9, l. 30, supply commas *after* but *and* were, *and read* by the processes of *for* in accordance with; p. 10, l. 8, *read* Mars *for "Mars";* pp. 10 ff., *read* Laocoon *for* Laokoon except in title of Lessing's work; p. 10, footnote, *read* Batteux *for* Batteaux.

GERMANIC *w*-GEMINATION. II

GERM. *-đw-*:*-dd-*

68. ME. *dudd, dudde* 'a coarse cloak,' NE. *duds* 'clothes' (used disparagingly), OHG *tutta* (*tuta*), *tutto* (*tuto*) 'Brustwarze, weibl. Brust,' Norw. *dodd* 'tuft, wisp; heap,' early Du. *dodde* 'Stengel, Stift,' Du. *dodde* 'liebkosende Benennung für ein Kind,' from **đuđw-*: Norw. *dott* 'tuft; heap,' *dotta* 'pile in little heaps,' *dytta* 'stop up, make tight; dam up; cram, pack,' OE. *dyttan* 'shut (ears); stop (mouth)'; OS. *dodro*, OHG. *totoro* 'Dotter,' NHG. Styr. *tudel* 'kurzes, dickes Weib; Puppe,' Skt. *dúdhitaḥ* 'dick, dicht, steif,' *dudhráḥ* 'steif, störrig' (cf. *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 333). Cf. No. 26.

69. Norw. *krodda* 'Käse von eingekochter Milch,' ME. *crudde* 'curds,' Germ. **kruđw-*, **kruđu-*: Ir. *gruth* (**grutu-*) 'geronnene Milch, Quark' (Fick, II^4, 119; III^4, 54).

70. OE. *codd* 'bag; cod, shell, husk,' ON. *kodde* 'cushion,' OSwed. *kodde* 'Hode,' MDu. *codde idem*, from **kuđwa-n-*: Lat. *guttus* 'a vessel for liquids,' **gutu̯os* 'round object,' Goth. *qiþus* (**gu̯etus*) 'belly,' OE. *cwidele* 'inflamed swelling,' *cēod* 'pouch, vessel.' Cf. No. 25.

71. MHG. *ratte* 'Kornrade, agrostemma,' NHG. Swiss, Bav. *ratte*, Germ. stem **rēđwan-*, **rađwan-*: early NHG. *ratwen*, OHG. *rāto*, OLG. *rāda* (cf. Fick, III^4, 337).

72. OE. *ruddoc*, ME. *ruddok*, NE. dial. *ruddock* 'robin redbreast,' Germ. **ruđwaka-*: Lith. *rudugỹs* 'September,' *rud̃úti* 'rötlichbraun werden,' *rudãvimas* 'das Braunwerden,' *ruduszis* 'Rotauge, cyprinus rutilus,' *rùdas* 'rötlich braun,' OE. *rudu* 'red color, rouge; redness.'

73. OE. *pudd* 'ditch,' Germ. **puđwa-*: Gr. *βυσσός* 'the depths of the sea' (**budhu̯ós* or **budhi̯ós*), *βύσσαλοι·βόθροι* Hes., *βυθός* 'the depth, esp. of the sea,' *βίθιος* 'in the deep, sunken, deep,' *τὰ βίθια* 'water-animals,' *βυθίζω* 'immerse, sink,' ME. *podel* 'puddle,' base **budh-* 'press down; sink; press, pack, cram, make big; swell, etc.,' also in the following (cf. IE. a^x 51).

74. MDu. *podde* 'toad,' *pudde* 'eel-pout,' Westfal. *puddek* 'lump, pudding, sausage,' NE. *pudding, poddy* 'round and stout in the belly,' LG. *puddig* 'thick, swollen,' Germ. *puđwa-* 'swollen; swelling, lump':OE. *pudoc* 'wen, wart,' NE. dial. *pud* 'paw,' MLG. *pudel* 'Dose, Beutel.' Cf. No. 28.

75. Norw. dial. *skadda, skodda* 'Nebel' (ON. **skadda*, gen. **skǫddu*), MHG. *schatte* (*schate*) 'Schatten,' Germ. **skađwa-* and *skađu-*:Goth. *skadus* 'shadow,' OHG. *scato*, gen. *scatuwes*, Gr. *σκότος* 'darkness' (cf. Fick, III,[4] 449).

76. OE. *sceadd* 'shad, clupea alosa,' Norw. *skadd* 'kleiner Schnäpel,' Germ. **skađwa-* 'thin, pointed':OE. *scæþþa* 'nail' (No. 61). For meaning compare NHG. *schnäpel* 'der Fisch salmo laveretus, mit sich schnabelartig spitzig verlängernder Schnauze.' To this primary meaning the use of NE. *shad* points:*shad-bird* 'the common American snipe; the common European sandpiper' (both birds so called from their pointed bills, not "with reference to their appearance at the shad-fishing season," which might apply to many other birds); *shad-bellied* 'thin-bellied,' the opposite of *pot-bellied.*

These are from a pre-Germ. stem **skhətu-* 'strip, thin piece,' Goth. *skaþuls* 'schädlich,' *skaþjan* 'schaden,' Gr. *ἀσκηθής* 'unharmed,' root **skhē-i-*:Skt. *chyáti* 'schneidet ab,' pp. *chātah, chitáh*, Gr. *σχάσις* 'a pricking, scarifying,' *σχάω* 'split' (*σχίζω*, Skt. *chinátti*, Lat. *scindo*, etc.), *σχάζω* 'slit, lance; burst open (of flowers),' *σχαστήριον* 'lancet': ON. *skata* 'Glattrochen,' Norw. *skata* 'Elster' ("nach dem spitz auslaufenden Schwanze benannt," Fick, III[4], 448), *skata* 'in eine Spitze hinauslaufen,' *skat* 'Wipfel eines Baumes,' Swed. dial. *skate* 'etwas Hervorspringendes, Wipfel, Landspitze.'

GERM. *-kw-*:*-kk-*

77. OHG. *acchus, accus, ackes* 'ax,' Germ. **akwisjō-, akwizjō-*: Goth. *aqizi* 'ax.' With *i*-syncopation also WGerm. **akus-* in OS., OLFranc. *acus*, OHG. *achus*, whence the *u* in *acchus* for **acchis.*

78. OHG. *nackot* 'nackt,' ON. *nøkkueðr, nǫkkueðr idem*, etc., Germ. **nakwiđa-, *nakwađa-*, Goth. *naqaþs*, etc. (pre-Germ. **nog^{u}-odho-, -edho-* 'nudus'), whence later also by syncope **nakuđa-*: MSwed. *nakudher*, OE. *nacod*, OHG. *nahhut*, etc.

79. ON. *nǫkkue* 'Nachen,' stem **nakwan-* and, with loss of *w*, **nakan* in OE. *naca*, OS. *naco*, OHG. *nahho*.

80. ON. *slǿkkua* (*slǿkua*) 'löschen, stillen,' **slakwian*, pre-Germ. **sloqu̯-*: Lat. *langueo*, Gr. λαγαρός, ON. *slakr* 'slack' (cf. Walde², 410).

81. OHG. *nicchessa*, MHG. *nickes* 'Nix,' **nikwes-* (and **nikus-*, *nikuz* in OHG. *nihhus*, ON. *nykr*, OE. *nicor*), pre-Germ. **nig^{u}es-*, Gr. *νίζω*, fut. *νίψω* 'wash.'

82. ON. *rǿkkr* 'darkness': Goth. *riqis idem*, Gr. ἔρεβος, Skt. *rájah*.

83. OIcel. *vǿkkua* 'zum Fliessen bringen,' ONorw. pres. *vækkir*: ON.*vǫkr* 'feucht,' from **vakuz*, Germ. **wakwaz*, IE. **u̯og^{u}o-*, Lat. *ūvidus*, Gr. ὑγρός 'wet.'

84. ME. *wricken*, NE. dial. *wrick* 'twist, turn,' Swed. *vricka*, Dan. *vrikke* 'move, turn, wriggle, sprain,' Du., LG. *wrikken* 'move to and fro,' *-kk-* from *-kw-*: Goth. *wraiqs*. Or in this case *-kk-* may be from *-kn̂*: Gr. ῥικνός 'bent.'

85. ON. acc. *kuikkuan*, *kykkuan* 'living' (nom. *kuikr* from **kwikur*, OE. *cwicu*, Germ. stem **kwikwa-*, pre-Germ. **g^{u}ig^{u}o-*, Lett. *dſiga* 'life,' cf. Walde², 846), OHG. *quek*, gen. *queckes*, OLFr. *quicca fē* 'live stock.'

86. ON. *þykkr*, *þiukkr* 'thick,' OE. *þicce*, OFries. *thikke*, OS. *thikki*, OHG. *dicchi*, etc., Germ. **þekwa-* (**þeku*): Ir. *tiug* (**tegu-*) 'thick.'

87. OE. *þaccian* 'pat, flap,' NIcel. *þjökka* 'schlagen, klopfen': OS. *thako-lon* 'streicheln,' **þaku-lōn*, Lat. *tango*, Gr. τεταγών (cf. Fick, III⁴, 565).

88. OE. *haccian* 'hack,' **hakwōn*, OFris. *tōhahkia* 'zerhacken,' MLG., MHG. *hacken*, *hacke* 'Hacke': MHG. *hachel*, *hechel* 'Hechel,' NE. *hatchel*, *hetchel*, *heckle* 'comb for flax or hemp,' verb 'comb, as flax or hemp; tease with questions,' OE. *haca* 'hook,' *hacod* 'pike (fish),' OS. *hacud idem*.

89. OE. *sæcce* acc. 'quarrel, strife,' WGerm. **sakwa*, Germ. **sakwǫ*: OE. nom. *sacu*, WGerm. **sak(w)u*, Germ. **sakwō*, pre-Germ. **(p)sog-u̯ā-*: Goth. *saku-ls* 'streitsüchtig,' *sakan* 'streiten,' OHG. *sahhan* 'tadeln, schelten, vor Gericht streiten,' ON. *saka* 'injure; blame, find fault with,' Gr. ψόγος 'blame, censure,' ψέγω 'lessen, disparage, blame,' Skt. *psāti* 'zehrt auf, zerkaut,' etc. These

are to be separated from OE. *forsacan* 'forsake, relinquish; refuse; deny,' OHG. *forsahhan* 'refuse; deny,' Goth. *sōkjan* 'seek,' etc.

GERM. *-hw-:-hh-*

90. OHG. *ahha* (*aha*) 'aqua': Goth. *aƕa; firlīche* (*firlīhe*) 'verleihe': Goth. *leiƕvai; nāhhitun* 'nahten': Goth. *nēƕidēdun; sehhan* 'sehen,' *sāhhun* 'sahen' (here analogical): Goth. *saiƕvan, sēƕvun* (cf. Braune, *Ahd. Gram.*, § 154, Anm. 6).

91. OE. *tiohhian*, Angl. *tihhian* (**tihwōjan*) 'arrange; determine, consider' (Bülbring, § 541), to which add the geminated MHG. *zechen* 'fügen, anordnen, schaffen, veranstalten; zechen' (OHG. **zehhōn, zehōn*), *zeche* 'Anordnung, Reihenfolge, Zunft, Zechgesellschaft,' MLG. *teche, techge, teghe idem*, Goth. *tēwa* 'Ordnung,' pre-Germ. **dĕk̑u̯-*: Serb.-Cr. *u-dešavati, -desiti* 'richten, zurecht machen; treffen,' OBulg. *desiti* 'finden,' Lat. *decet, decus*, Skt. *daçasyáti* 'erweist Ehre, ist gnädig,' *dāçati* 'erweist Verehrung, gewährt.'

92. OE. *ceahhettan* 'laugh loudly,' **kahwatjan* (Bülbring, § 541), from an OE. **ceahhian* preserved in NE. *chaff* 'assail with sarcastic banter or ridicule, make game of, banter, ridicule,' sb. 'banter, ridicule,' MHG. *kach* 'lautes Lachen' (**kahwa-*), *kachen, kachzen*, OHG. *kachazzen, kahhazzen* 'laut lachen.'

93. OE. *cohhetan* 'cough; shout,' **kuhwatjan, *cohhian, *cūhhian*, ME. *coghen, coughen* (*couwen*), NE. *cough* (kɔf), MDu. *cochen, cuchen* 'cough, wheeze; groan,' LG. *kuchen, küchen* 'keuchen,' MHG. *kūchen idem*.

94. OE. *seohhe* 'strainer, Seihe,' **sihwōn-* (Bülbring, § 541), MLG. *sigge* (*sīge, sie*) 'Seihe,' *siggen* (*sīgen, sien*) 'seihen' (or these with *-gg-* from *-gw-*), NHG. Tyrol. *seichen* 'seihen,' MDu. *sichene* 'Sieb,' and perhaps also *sichten* 'sichten; seihen' (**sihwatjan*?), IE. root **seiq̑u̯*.

95. OE. *geneahhe* 'sufficiently; frequently,' **nahwē, *nok̑u̯ē̃d*: Lith. *naszùs* 'gute Früchte tragend, fruchtbar,' *nèszti* 'tragen,' Lat. *nanciscor* 'reach,' Goth. *ganah* 'genügt,' etc., and probably *nēƕs* 'nahe.'

96. MDu. *crochen* 'groan, moan,' Du. dial. *krochen, kruchen* 'groan; wheeze,' MLG. *krochen* 'grunzen, krächzen,' **kruhw-*: Gr. γρύζω 'grunt, mutter,' γρυκτός 'to be muttered.'

97. OE. *pohha* 'pouch, bag,' **puhwan-* 'swelling,' MLG. *poche* (and *pocke*) 'Blatter, Pustel,' *puchen* (*puggen*) 'pochen, trotzen,' MDu. *pochen puchen* 'bacchari, debacchari; tonare murmure et

verberibus; et jactare, jactitare':*pogge* 'toad' (**pugw-*), Gr. *βυκάνη* 'trumpet,' Russ.-Ch.Sl. *bučati* 'dröhnen,' Pol. *buczec'* 'brüllen, tönen, weinen,' *buczyć siç* 'sich aufblasen,' *buczny* 'stolz, prahlerisch; übermütig,' etc. (cf. Berneker, I, 98 f.). In this group occur the geminations *kk, hh, gg.*

98. WS., Kent. *geohhol,* Angl. *gehhol* 'Yule, Christmas' and WS., Kent. *hweohhol* 'wheel' are given in Bülbring, *Ae. El.,* § 543, as examples of "Dehnung vor l." But both of these words had an *h* followed by *w,* and this was the cause of the gemination. For *geohhol* represents Germ. **jehwla-,* while *gēol* 'Yule,' *gēola* 'December,' Goth. *jiuleis idem* are from **je(g)wl-,* IE. **i̯eq^{u}lo-*:Gr. *ἐψία* 'sport, game, amusement' (cf. Boisacq, *s.v.*). So also *hweohhol; hweog(u)l, hweowol, hwēol* come from **hwehwla-; *hwegwla-*:Skt. *cakrám* 'wheel.'

99. OHG. *nihhein, nechein, nohhein,* 'keiner'; *dihhein, dehhein, dechein* (*thegein*), *thohhein* 'irgend ein' are explained as having "secondary gemination" from original *nihein, dihein,* etc., in which *h* was final and therefore a spirant (*nih-ein*), but in composition was drawn over in part to the second syllable (*nih-hein*), and so properly written as a gemination (cf. Braune, *Ahd. Gr.,* § 154, Anm. 6). This explanation would imply the formation of *nihhein,* etc., in OHG. from *nih* and *ein.* The compounds must have been much earlier (:OS. *nigēn, negēn*), and as collocations even pre-Germ. *Nihhein* represents Germ. **nehwe ainaz* 'neque unus'; *nohhein* (which need not be regarded as having *o* for *e* in the proclitic position, Braune, § 29, Anm. 3) from **nuhwe ainaz*:OHG. *noch* 'neque,' probably identical with *noh,* Goth. *nauh* 'noch, adhuc,' with the negative force derived from its use with *ni,* and also influenced by *nih.* Or *noh* 'neque' may come from **n-u-q^{u}e*:*n-* from **ene* 'not,' Lat. *nē, ne-,* and also *in-* 'un-,' Gr. *ἀν-* (*ₑn-*), *ἀ-* (*ῃ-*); *-u-,* perhaps an ablaut form of Lat. *-ve, vē-,* OBulg. *u-* (Gr. *οὐ*?), and added to the negative in Gr. *ἄνευ* 'without' (**ₑn-eu*), Goth. *inu* (**en-u*), OHG. *āno* (**ēn-ou*). *Dihhein, dehhein* 'irgend ein' comes from Germ. **þehwe ainaz,* pre-Germ. **teq^{u}e* 'irgend', stem **to-, *te-,* whence also **te-s* in Goth. *þis-hun* '*μάλιστα*,' *-hvaduh* 'whithersoever,' *-hvah* 'whatever,' *-hvaruh* 'wherever,' *-hvazuh* 'whoever.' Similarly *thohhein* is formed from a **tu-q^{u}e,* which is also in OHG. *doh* 'doch,' from an IE. stem **tu, tu̯o-*:Skt. *tva-ḥ, tua-ḥ* 'mancher, der eine,' *ŭ* 'doch, nun, aber,' OE. *þus* 'thus, so,' etc.

100. OE. **rohhe, reohhe* 'a fish' (*-ēo-*?), MDu. *rochche, roche, rochghe, rogghe* 'roach' (sea-fish), MLG. *roche, ruche idem*, NE. *rough* (rʌf) 'rauh,' implying OE. **rūhh*, Germ. **rŭhwa-n-*: OE. *rūh* 'shaggy, hairy, rough,' *rȳhœ, rȳje, rēowe* 'blanket, rug,' OLG. *rūgi, rūwi* 'rauhes Fell,' OHG. *rūh* 'haaricht, struppig,' NHG. *rauch* 'mit Haaren, Federn, Stacheln bewachsen,' *rauchware* 'Pelzware,' pre-Germ. **rŭq̣o-* 'rough, broken,' **ruq-* 'pull, tear, break': Lat. *runco* 'pull out, weed,' Gr. *ῥυκάνη* 'plane,' Skt. *luñcáti* 'rauft, rauft aus, rupft, enthülst,' *rūkṣáḥ* 'rauh,' etc. For meaning compare Lat. *rumpo*: Lith. *rupas* 'rauh, höckerig, holprig.'

GERM. *-gu-, -gw-*: *-gg-*

101. OE. *mæcgas* 'boys,' Germ. **magwōs*: nom. *magu*, Goth. *magus* (cf. Kluge *Pauls Grdr.*, I², 379; Bülbring, *Ae. El.*, § 541). Unfortunately this is not conclusive, since *mæcg-* may rather represent WGerm. **magj-*, which would regularly occur in the loc. sing. and the nom. plur.: Germ. **magiwi; *magiwiz*, OHG. *suniu*, later *suni;* Goth. *magjus, sunjus*, OHG. *suni.*

102. ME. *schoggen*, 'shake, agitate,' Norw. dial. *skygg* 'scheu, furchtsam,' Germ. **skugwia-*, Swed. *skygga* 'scheu werden': MHG. *schiuhen, schiuwen* 'verscheuchen' (cf. Fick, III,⁴ 467). Cf. No. 35.

103. OE. *raggig* 'shaggy,' NE. *rag, ragged*, ON. *rǫgg, rǫggr* 'long coarse wool,' **ragwō-, -wa-*: OE. *ragu* 'lichen,' OLG. *raginna* 'long hair, saetas,' MDu. *raegh* 'cobweb,' Skt. *raçanā* 'Strick, Riemen, Zügel, Gurt,' *raçmiḥ* 'Strang, Riemen, Zügel, Messchnur, Strahl.' Compare the root **reĝ-* in ON. *rekende*, OE. *racente*, OHG. *rahhinza* 'chain, fetter,' ON. *rakke*, OE. *racca* 'cord forming part of rigging of ship.'

104. ME. *roggen* 'rock, move back and forth,' Icel. *rugga* 'rock, roll,' *rugg* 'a rocking, rolling,' *rugga* 'a rocking cradle,' Germ. **rugw-*: MLG. *rogen* 'regen, rühren, bewegen, erregen,' Icel. *rugl* 'confusion, disorder,' *rugla* 'confuse': ME. *rokken* 'rock,' No. 34.

105. NE. *prog* 'a poke, prod; a pointed instrument for poking or prodding,' verb 'poke, prod; poke about, prowl,' Germ. **prugg-, *prugw-*, pre-Germ. **bṛĝhu-*: Gr. *βραχύς* 'small, short,' EFris. *prakken* 'pressen.' Cf. No. 38.

FRANCIS A. WOOD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HEINE'S RETURN TO GOD

Recantation has been the fate of many ultra-free thinkers. In his renunciation of paganism and his return to God, Heinrich Heine finds himself in illustrious company. Brentano, Tolstoy, Wilde, Strindberg—to mention only a few—experienced the struggle and the bitterness of a similar facing-about, when their philosophy of life was put under the strain of an unexpected test.

Involuntarily one is apt to refer to these cases as instances of conversion. The term is convenient, and no psychology of conversion could afford to neglect the lives of these men in studying the fundamental laws of the psychic life. Yet it must be remembered that, on the whole, theology has had an undisputed monopoly of this term and that psychology must hesitate to use it so long as it is not freed from some of its most clinging associations. Thus conversion is regarded by theology as essentially a new attitude of mind prompted by an act of divine grace—accordingly as something imposed from without rather than prepared by slow, invisible growth from within,[1] whereas science must necessarily discard any such mystical factor in its analyses. The frequent "suddenness" of conversion, therefore, becomes only an apparent suddenness. Furthermore, conversion customarily signifies the acceptance of a more or less definite religious orthodoxy, and its genuineness is attested by an overwhelming sense of sin.

As regards Heine, therefore, at any rate, discretion forbids the use of the term "conversion," inasmuch as his change of philosophy was neither sudden, nor in the direction of any religious orthodoxy, nor accompanied by any marked sense of sin.

To turn from the slippery ground of terms to the rock bottom of facts, however, the fundamental veering-about of Heine on the basic question of eternal values, during the last decade of his life, is an indisputable fact. It is a fact despite the slip-shod haste of

[1] It is, of course, beyond the scope of this paper to touch upon the dilemma created for theology by the interaction between God's arbitrary grace and a "free will" on the part of man.

still occasionally recurring denials which pretend to see in Heine's recantation of paganism simply a last gigantic hoax and mystification of the public.[1] Such denials come from two classes of people: from those who have never examined the data first-hand; and from those who are incapable of approaching any complex psychological question with an open mind.

Avoiding controversy, I shall in the course of this paper (1) touch upon the chief data establishing Heine's mental transformation as a fact; (2) show in some detail the nature of Heine's new attitude; and (3) attempt the more difficult task of analyzing the motives which prompted Heine's renunciation of his past.

I

The first signs of a religious crisis preparing itself in Heine occur in 1845—that memorable year which marked the beginning of Heine's bitter struggle with his family over the legacy he claimed from his deceased uncle Solomon, and marked also the beginning of the general paralysis which ended in his death.[2] A letter bearing the date of October 31, addressed to his friend and publisher, Campe, shows that Heine was already at that time aware of a change going on within him and that he struggled against it. With prophetic intuition he says: "Ein tieferer Ernst, ein unklarer Ungestüm hat mich ergriffen, der vielleicht eigentümlich furchtbare Ausbrüche gestattet in Prosa und Versen—aber das ist doch nicht was mir ziemt und was ich wollte." Three years later this change had progressed far enough for Heine to substitute "God" for "the gods" in his letters. The substance of this change from an aesthetic polytheism to a more sober deism is not altered by the frivolous tone with which Heine remarks apropos of the revolutionary turmoil of 1848: "Das ist Universalanarchie, Weltkuddelmuddel, sichtbar

[1] Johannes Scherr, for instance: "Heine hat den bekannten Bekehrungswitz im Romanzero losgelassen," *Allg. Gesch. d. Lit.* (1880), II, 380.

[2] An earlier religious crisis of brief duration occurred in 1836, when Heine experienced a sharp reaction against the life of sensuous enjoyment which he had begun to lead with the beautiful charmer who later became his wife. The struggle within his soul between his "Hellenic" doctrines of enjoyment and his longings for a crown of thorns is vividly depicted in a letter to the Princess Belgiojoso (October 30, 1836) and in his famous Tannhäuser poem. This time, however, in reality, as in the poem, Hellenism came off triumphant and his "Nazarene" longings were forgotten in a continued whirl of pleasure.

gewordener Gotteswahnsinn! Der Alte muss eingesperrt werden, wenn das so fortgeht. Das haben die Atheisten verschuldet, die ihn toll geärgert" (letter to Campe, July 9, 1848). Nor is it altered by the fact that Heine seems averse to blaming the gods for his sufferings, rather singling out God for the purpose: "Nie haben die Götter, oder vielmehr der liebe Gott (wie ich jetzt zu sagen pflege), einen Menschen ärger heimgesucht" (letter to Campe, April 30, 1849). Yet sporadic passages from private letters like these would not carry the force of conviction, were they not supplemented by public declarations on Heine's part beginning with 1849. In an open letter of that year he makes this frank confession:

> Unterdessen, ich will es freimütig gestehen, ist eine grosse Umwandlung mit mir vorgegangen: ich bin kein göttlicher Bipede mehr; ich bin nicht mehr der "freieste Deutsche nach Goethe," wie mich Ruge in gesündern Tagen genannt hat; ich bin nicht mehr der grosse Heide Nr. II, den man mit dem weinlaubumkränzten Dionysus verglich, während man meinem Kollegen Nr. I den Titel eines grossherzoglichen weimar'schen Jupiter erteilte; ich bin kein lebensfreudiger, etwas wohlbeleibter Hellene mehr, der auf trübsinnige Nazarener herablächelte—ich bin jetzt nur ein armer totkranker Jude, ein abgezehrtes Bild des Jammers, ein unglücklicher Mensch [VII, 537–38].[1]

Two years later followed Heine's famous *Nachwort zum Romanzero*, in which he bade a touching farewell to his beloved idols and unequivocally stated that he had made his peace with God. He had not entered the fold of any church nor embraced any particular set of dogmas, he declared, to guard against any misunderstanding; he had simply returned from the veiled atheism of the Hegelians to the faith in a personal God—a God with a will, and a God with the power to help (I, 485 ff.).

From this time forth not only Heine's personal letters but all his literary writings up to his death repeat and emphasize the change that had taken place within him. Thus his will, as drawn up in 1851, states that four years previously he had renounced all philosophic pride and returned to religious ideas and feelings and that he was prepared to die a believer in an only God, the eternal creator of the world whose mercy he implored for his immortal soul (VII, 520). Similarly his Preface in 1852 to the new edition of his *Religion*

[1] This and all subsequent quotations are based on Elster's edition.

and Philosophy in Germany is a confession that everything in that book pertaining to God was as false as it was thoughtlessly uttered (IV, 156), a repudiation which he reiterates and enlarges upon in his *Geständnisse,* written the year following (VI, 41 ff, 50, 53, 70, etc.). Finally, the prefatory remarks to his *Memoirs*—Heine's last essay in prose—leave no doubt that an earlier version of this work had to be destroyed by the author, partly owing to religious scruples (VII, 522, 458).

The seriousness of any one of the passages alluded to, individually considered, might indeed be questioned by a skeptical reader, wont to look in Heine's writings only for wit, even at his own expense. Taken as a whole, however, and in connection with the poetry of the same period which I have not even touched upon for want of space, they must convince any open-minded reader of the genuineness of Heine's return to God. This conviction will be sustained in examining Heine's attitude toward his newly found God and toward religion in general.

II

Heine was well aware that his religious orientation after 1848 involved a sweeping repudiation of his past teachings and professions, and he faced this repudiation with the utmost frankness. Instead of trying to make capital out of the religious mantle with which he had been wont in the early thirties to drape his gospel of enjoyment, he discarded all ornamental trappings and admitted that what he had taught and practiced had amounted to atheism, similar to a defendant at the bar who hopes to lighten his sentence by a clean confession. Rather than resort to denial, he sought to base his plea for indulgence on extenuating circumstances. Heine reminded the reader of his *Confessions*—and God, by implication—that as a child he had been exposed to the doctrines of French eighteenth-century materialism (VI, 69), and that in later life he had been seduced by the authority attaching to the Hegelian school. He had never been an abstract thinker; he had simply repeated what the leaders of the school taught him as true; and he admitted that belief in Hegelianism had come to him so naturally because it flattered his vanity to regard himself as an autonomous God, the

source of all authority and moral law (VI, 48). Thus he regarded his former atheism in the light of a serious error rather than of a sin. He experienced nothing resembling a crushing sense of guilt calling for expiation and atonement.

In accord with this mental attitude is the marvelous equanimity with which Heine endured his terrible sufferings. While at times his agony became so acute that he could feel nothing but the divine hand smiting him in blind wrath, he preferred in moments of lesser tension to regard his tortures not as punishment but rather as a divine visitation serving for his further purification. After, as before, he loved to contemplate his past life with serenity and satisfaction; to mirror his soul and behold it beautiful and pure, marred only by scars but not disfigured by blemishes. "Die Hülle fällt ab von der Seele, und du kannst sie betrachten in ihrer schönen Nacktheit. Da sind keine Flecken, nur Wunden" (VII, 459).[1]

Thus, to the last, Heine was enamored of his own fair image. In his youth he had sensed this sweet odor of self-adoration by conjuring up in his dreams and his poems the vampire maid of ghostly beauty, the mermaid and the nymph, who stole to his couch to cover him, passively submitting, with passionate caresses. The denial of the love he craved from his cousin Amalie had thrown him into paroxysms of rage, threatening suicide. In later life he had vaunted as none other the sweet incense of flattery. He never wavered in his affection for his mother, who must have been the first to awaken these stirrings in his bosom. And now, when the end was in sight, when less deeply rooted traits of his nature gave way under the impetus of unforseen attack, this self-love maintained itself in his relation to his newly found God.

The God with whose company Heine beguiled the long years of slow torture had to respond above all to Heine's desire to be loved.

[1] From numerous passages in a similar vein, I quote the following from his letters: "Ja, ich bin sehr körperkrank, aber die Seele hat wenig gelitten; eine müde Blume, ist sie ein bischen gebeugt, aber keineswegs welk, und sie wurzelt noch fest in der Wahrheit und Liebe" (to Varnhagen, January 3, 1846).

"Das holdselige Bewusstsein, ein schönes Leben geführt zu haben, erfüllt meine Seele selbst in dieser kummervollen Zeit; wird mich auch hoffentlich in der letzten Stunde bis an den weissen Abgrund begleiten" (to Campe, September 1, 1846).

"Mein Körper leidet grosse Qual, aber meine Seele ist ruhig wie ein Spiegel und hat manchmal auch noch ihre schönen Sonnenaufgänge und Sonnenuntergänge" (to Campe, December 14, 1852).

God had to be conceived as a loving and indulgent father. Heine could not but regard himself as a favorite child of God's—a child whose very failings, though they required punishment, could not help giving pleasure to the Almighty; a child whose word carried weight with his heavenly father, and whose intercession for his fellow-mortals would be given benevolent consideration by the Creator.[1]

Around this central nucleus Heine built up his conception of God. He endowed his God with the attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, wisdom, justice, and mercy which the deists had left him, after stripping him of his more concrete human qualities; but he added a new attribute with which neither the stern English deists nor the flippant Voltaire had thought of clothing him: a sense of humor. God was enthroned by Heine as a heavenly Aristophanes who found intense enjoyment in the wit of his small human replica in Paris, who listened to the earthly poet's mellifluous verses with evident pleasure, and who treated even an occasional quip at his own expense with good-natured tolerance. But at the same time, in order not to let his favorite son forget his superior authority, he would play now and then one of his own cruelly practical jokes at the earthly joker's expense, so as to make him remember that he could be other things also besides a comedian (VI, 73).

Feuerbach's famous remark, according to which man has created God after his own image, holds particularly true of so subjective a poet as Heine. Its truth is borne out in the manner of the relations which Heine maintained with his God; in the tone of their social intercourse—speaking figuratively and yet not too figuratively. This tone, as to be expected, varies with the poet's mood of the moment. At times Heine is but the poor mortal, speaking humbly to the unfathomably superior Creator. But more often supplication, prayer, or reverence are replaced by a tone of intimate familiarity. God then divests himself of his divine robes of state, as it were. He allows Heine to feel himself on a pretended level with him. The

[1] Take, for example, the following: "Je te salue, cher lecteur, et je prie Dieu qu' il t'aie dans sa sainte et digne garde" (Préface to the *Poèmes et Légendes* [1855], I, 499). Incidentally, omitting the salutation, these words used to constitute the customary close of letters of royalty. It is commonly found, for instance, in the letters of Frederick the Great.

solemn audience gives way to familiar conversation on a level of equality. At such moments, Heine, in a bantering tone, lets the Lord know that he is quite willing to put up with the sinfulness of the world a little longer and enjoy the *status quo*, provided the Lord sees his way clear to granting him a little better health and a trifle more money (*Zum Lazarus*, 11; II, 97–98). Or he permits himself to point out to the Lord a certain inconsistency in creating a humorous poet such as he and then ruining his mood (*Miserere*, II, 89). Then, again, the injustice which he sees enthroned in the world drives him to the verge of positive blasphemy:

Warum schleppt sich blutend, elend,
Unter Kreuzlast der Gerechte,
Während glücklich als ein Sieger
Trabt auf hohem Ross der Schlechte?

Woran liegt die Schuld? Ist etwa
Unser Herr nicht ganz allmächtig?
Oder treibt er selbst den Unfug?
Ach, das wäre niederträchtig.

[*Zum Lazarus*, 1, II, 92.]

But such outbursts find their reaction in cries like:

Ertrage die Schickung und versuch
Gelinde zu flennen, zu beten.

[*Zum Lazarus* 2, II, 92.]

Familiarity, banter, and criticism bordering on blasphemy were in the make-up of Heine's intercourse with his God. He felt no pangs on their account, even if at times his expression shot beyond the mark set by the respect due an almighty creator. Such freedom of expression constituted the inalienable right of the poet, and he would have resented any curtailment of it as much as any free citizen resents the limitation of frank criticism and daring caricature of the government. He would have resented it the more, as he felt that he was playing the game fair. Ever since the time of his return to God he had carefully refrained from publishing anything that in his opinion would tend to undermine the authority of God as such. In loyalty to his new religious viewpoint he had consigned his memoirs to the flames. He had suppressed countless atheistic witticisms, and he had sacrificed priceless gems of poetry.[1] Such

[1] VI, 51; I, 485; letters to Campe of June 1, 1849, and June 1, 1850, etc.

proofs of loyalty established a claim for divine indulgence, even if the poet's language became a trifle too bold or his anthropomorphization of the Creator a trifle too grotesque.

The poem *Himmelfahrt* (II, 217) is a case in point, illustrating the liberties Heine permitted himself when his poetic fancy attached itself to the figure of the Creator. He burlesques St. Peter, the heavenly gatekeeper (following in this case the precedent of the German folk legend); he burlesques the heavenly atmosphere; he burlesques the great Lord himself, for whose divine benefit the heavenly establishment is being run. The tolerant good humor of St. Peter, based on the reflection that it happens to be his birthday when Heine knocks at the gate; St. Peter's careful instructions to the newcomer to be circumspect about his conduct, to suppress feelings of fatigue or boredom at any cost, and to be even a trifle overdemonstrative in his relations to the Lord, inasmuch as even His Divine Self liked a touch of flattery now and then; and lastly St. Peter's *sub rosa* invitation to Heine for an occasional game of cards—these are phantasies that bespeak the sweetest naïve humor, without a touch of malice or blasphemy. Poems like *Himmelfahrt* merely show that God had entered not only Heine's mind as a concept but his imagination as well; that God had assumed the character of a concrete personality whose presence brought consolation and entertainment to the poet's sick bed. The danger of the reader's taking such fanciful character delineations of the Creator too literally is, happily, not very great, provided he remembers that Heine was at all times a poet and at the same time a great deal of a child, practicing a child's *naivété* and enjoying its license. But it is well to recall Heine's own comment on his return to God, as set forth in a letter to Georg Weerth dated November 5, 1851:

> Es freut mich, dass Ihnen meine Vorrede (zum Romanzero) gefallen hat; leider habe ich weder Zeit noch Stimmung gehabt, darin auszusprechen, was ich eben dartun wollte, nämlich, dass ich als Dichter sterbe, der weder Religion noch Philosophie braucht und mit beiden nichts zu schaffen hat. Der Dichter versteht sehr gut das symbolische Idiom der Religion und das abstrakte Verstandeskauderwelsch der Philosophie, aber weder die Herren der Religion noch die der Philosophie werden jemals den Dichter verstehen, dessen Sprache ihnen immer spanisch vorkommen wird, wie dem Massmann das Latein. Durch diese linguistische Unkenntnis geschah es, dass diese und jene Herren sich einbildeten, ich sei ein Betbruder geworden.

316

It must be added, on the other hand, that this letter understates the positive character of the change that was proceeding in Heine; for it does not allude to his recasting of ethical values. It does not mention the fact that the philosophy of enjoyment, to the proclamation of which Heine had seemed foreordained, was slowly but surely being replaced by a more austere morality.

Though less striking than his return to belief in God, Heine's new ethical orientation is an even more significant factor in the readjustment of his personality, face to face with approaching dissolution.

In the *Nachwort zum Romanzero* (1851), Heine had bidden a touching farewell to his beloved pagan gods. In *Die Götter im Exil* (1853), he bestowed a last fondly lingering look upon their beloved company, most of all on Dionysus-Bacchus, whom he calls "der Heiland der Sinnenlust" (VI, 83). In parting from them he had also turned his back upon the life of enjoyment of which the gods were to him concrete symbolical impersonations. He had been forced to take farewell of it personally, because his body had wasted to a mere shadow; but, now that he saw it only from afar, its glamor also waned, and he saw the antithesis between the life of sense and the life of the spirit, which he had been wont to state in the extreme form of antinomy, in a new light. The two polar opposites of sensualism and spiritualism, or Hellenism and Nazarenism, as he renamed them after 1836, remained, for the most part, as far apart as ever, but his thought no longer spontaneously gravitated to the Hellenic pole. The spiritual dignity of morality loomed in a new light, and Heine's *Geständnisse* reach their climax in the statement, "Gutsein ist besser denn Schönheit" (VI, 60).

Even attempts to reconcile opposites which had heretofore seemed irreconcilable are not lacking. Thus the beautiful fragment *Bimini* speaks of two divine messages brought from Byzantium (the Renaissance), and from Egypt (the Bible):

> Buch der Schönheit heisst das eine,
> Buch der Wahrheit heisst das andre.
>
> Beide aber hat Gott selber
> Abgefasst in zwei verschiednen
> Himmelssprachen, und er schrieb sie,
> Wie wir glauben, eigenhändig [II, 126].

But it was too late for Heine to effect any real synthesis. In his swan song, the poem entitled *Für die Mouche*, the antithesis is again as glaring as ever:

> Die Gegensätze sind hier grell gepaart,
> Des Griechen Lustsinn und der Gottgedanke
> Judäas! [II, 47].

And from the depths of his soul comes the despairing outcry:

> O, dieser Streit wird enden nimmermehr,
> Stets wird die Wahrheit hadern mit dem Schönen,
> Stets wird geschieden sein der Menschheit Heer
> In zwei Partein: Barbaren und Hellenen [II, 49].

The import of Heine's change of front toward morality becomes clear in the light of the peculiar setting in which it makes its appearance. Heine's new valuation of morality emerges simultaneously with the reawakening of his love for his race. "Meine Vorliebe für Hellas hat . . . . abgenommen," his thought runs in his *Confessions*. "Ich sehe jetzt, die Griechen waren nur schöne Jünglinge, die Juden waren aber immer Männer, nicht bloss ehemals, sondern bis auf den heutigen Tag, trotz achtzehn Jahrhunderten der Verfolgung und des Elends" (VI, 55).

In his youth Heine had shown an active interest in the history of Judaism. For a time he had been active as a member of the Berlin group which was working toward the end of raising the cultural level of their race which had so long been kept outside the pale of European civilization. From the interest in the fate of the Jews during the Middle Ages had sprung his novel *Der Rabbi von Bacharach*, which he left unfinished when his interest in Judaism began to wane under the pressure of other tasks and when the formulation of distinctly cosmopolitan and humanitarian ideals alienated him from the problem of Judaism as such. In the course of time his "Hellenic" philosophy of enjoyment had forced him into a state of active hostility against Judaism as a *Weltanschauung*. But now, with the collapse of his Hellenism and the enforced leisure of the sick bed his old interest in the people of his race resurged and grew in intensity to passionate love.[1]

[1] Signs of Heine's returning love for Judaism are not lacking even earlier. In the wild-huntsman's vision of *Atta Troll* (1842), the Jewess Herodias carries the prize before the romantic "Fee Abunde" and the Greek Diana (II, 401).

Thus, beginning with the *Romanzero*, Judaism becomes the central theme of his poetry. Biblical episodes are treated with a mastery of language and a vividness of outline which bespeak the intensity with which Heine recreated the past of his race (*Das goldne Kalb; König David; Salomo*). The culture of medieval Spanish Judaism is immortalized in *Jehuda ben Halevy;* and its gloomy counterpart, ferocious orthodoxy, is depicted with a mixture of railing humor and mordant irony in the famous *Disputation.* The beauty and the tragedy of modern Judaism, again, find their finest expression in *Der Apollogott* and *Prinzessin Sabbath.*

Towering in Heine's mind, however, above all the Jewish characters that fired his imagination was the great prophet Moses. The more Heine read the Bible during his years of solitude, the more was he overwhelmed by the grandeur of the Moses of the Pentateuch. "Welche Riesengestalt!" he exclaims in his *Confessions.* "Wie klein erscheint der Sinai, wenn der Moses darauf steht! Dieser Berg ist nur das Postament, worauf die Füsse des Mannes stehen, dessen Haupt in den Himmel hineinragt, wo er mit Gott spricht" (VI, 54 ff.). He sees in Moses the genius who gave the world a God; the wise organizer who welded tribes of nomads into a nation. The vastness of the task which Moses conceived and carried out appealed to Heine as a monumental work of art; he extolled Moses as a supreme artist, a builder of human pyramids and human obelisks (VI, 55). At the same time Moses appeared to him a far-seeing guardian of liberty, whose agrarian laws should serve as models to future generations. He calls him a practical socialist and a great emancipator (VI, 61). Thus Heine's penchant for hero-worship leads him to include Moses in the ranks of his supermen. Goethe, Napoleon, and at one time Hegel are the only others whose greatness he feels to be incommensurable to human standards. But Moses towers supreme, when Heine surveys his gallery of heroes:

Einer nur, ein einz'ger Held
Gab uns mehr und gab uns Bessres
Als Kolumbus, das ist jener,
Der uns einen Gott gegeben.

Sein Herr Vater, der hiess Amram,
Seine Mutter hiess Jochebeth,

Und er selber, Moses heisst er,
Und er ist mein bester Heros.
[*Vitzliputzli*, I, 374 ff.]

So Heine's return to God is intimately bound up with his return to racial consciousness. The Jews have become for him the people with a predestined mission. They are the nation that gave the world a God and a moral law (VI, 56), and guarded their treasure by preserving the Bible through centuries of persecution (VI, 58). And despite the caricatures of the idea of Judaism which Heine finds in Scotland, Denmark, North Germany, and the United States, despite the somber gray of a puritanism that guards the letter more than the spirit, he is convinced that the morality of ancient Judaism will remain in the face of change as the genuine, the imperishable and the true (VI, 60).

Love of one's neighbor and purity of spirit constitute in part the morality of Judaism, as Heine conceived it (VI, 59). In view of the fact, however, that Heine's former Hellenism had made sensuous enjoyment the crucial point of issue, the essence of the morality of Judaism is clearly set forth in the following paragraph:

> Judäa erschien mir immer wie ein Stück Occident, das sich mitten in den Orient verloren. In der Tat, mit seinem spiritualistischen Glauben, seinen strengen, keuschen, sogar asketischen Sitten, kurz mit seiner abstrakten Innerlichkeit, bildete dieses Land und sein Volk immer den sonderbarsten Gegensatz zu den Nachbarländern und Nachbarvölkern, die den üppig buntesten und brünstigsten Naturkulten huldigend, im bacchantischen Sinnenjubel ihr Dasein verluderten. Israel sass fromm unter seinem Feigenbaum und sang das Lob des unsichtbaren Gottes und übte Tugend und Gerechtigkeit, während in den Tempeln von Babel, Ninive, Sidon und Tyrus jene blutigen und unzüchtigen Orgien gefeiert wurden, ob deren Beschreibung uns noch jetzt das Haar sich sträubt [VI, 61].

After the foregoing it is clear that there could be no question of a rapprochement on Heine's part to any branch of the Christian church. Heine protested against any such interpretation on numerous occasions, at times in a grave, dignified way with a marked show of courtesy toward both Catholicism and Lutheranism, and at times with the impish smile that made him the *enfant terrible* of the orthodox (VI, 56 f., 65 f.; VII, 519, etc.). However, quite apart from dogma of any sort, Heine's new conception of morality

is not tinged with any specifically Christian elements. Heine made no half-hearted attempts to love his enemies, as Christianity prescribes. He hated them with a clean conscience, based on ample Old Testament precedent. His remark in the *Nachwort zum Romanzero* to the effect that, since he was in need of God's mercy himself, he had granted amnesty to all his enemies, constituted at best a pious wish. It did not prevent him, at any rate, from including in the *Romanzero* itself a poem entitled *Vermächtnis*, in which he bequeathed all his physical ailments to his enemies (I, 429). In one of his posthumous poems he likewise makes over a varied assortment of undesirable legacies to individuals and groups that had incurred his wrath (*Testament*, II, 220), while a whole group of such poems heaps maledictions on the heads of Karl Heine and his kin (II, 104–9). Besides, one of his posthumous aphorisms leaves nothing to be desired in the way of frankness:

> Ich habe die friedlichste Gesinnung. Meine Wünsche sind: eine bescheidene Hütte, ein Strohdach, aber ein gutes Bett, gutes Essen, Milch und Butter, sehr frisch, vor dem Fenster Blumen, vor der Tür einige schöne Bäume, und wenn der liebe Gott mich ganz glücklich machen will, lässt er mich die Freude erleben, dass an diesen Bäumen etwa sechs bis sieben meiner Feinde aufgehängt werden. Mit gerührtem Herzen werde ich ihnen vor ihrem Tode alle Unbill verzeihen, die sie mir im Leben zugefügt—ja, man muss seinen Feinden verzeihen, aber nicht früher, als bis sie gehängt worden [VII, 400].

This frank, virile hatred is, however, not incompatible with a large capacity for sympathy, such as we look for in vain during Heine's days of prosperity. In this respect his own suffering has taught him a lesson. Poems like *Pomare*, *Sklavenschiff*, *Jammertal*, show a stirring of deep symapthy for the sick, the oppressed, and the poor. To point out how Heine's sympathies during the years of his decline incline more and more to the loser in the struggle for survival would lead us too far afield. Suffice it to remember Legras' happy characterization of the *Romanzero* as "le livre d'or des vaincus."

A sketch of Heine's return to God and the morality of his forefathers would not be complete without mention of Heine's attitude toward the problem of survival after death. As a rule men "get

religion" at the approach of death. Fear of eternal punishment is undoubtedly the motive underlying most conversions.

Speculations on immortality and resurrection, on heaven and hell form a persistent topic of Heine's sick-bed musings. Occasionally he professed a certain uneasiness in regard to the eternal flames. Commenting on the haste with which he destroyed such poetic productions as he felt would compromise him in the eyes of God, he remarks: "Es ist besser, dass die Verse brennen, als der Versifex" (I, 485; cf. VI, 51). In the same connection he admits that the prospect of immortality has something very appealing to a poor wretched mortal. With undisguised pleasure he notes that the concept of God involves that of immortality as its generally accepted corollary. Having developed the attributes of God after the manner of the deists, he adds:

> Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, unsre Fortdauer nach dem Tode wird uns alsdann gleichsam mit in den Kauf gegeben, wie der schöne Markknochen, den der Fleischer, wenn er mit seinen Kunden zufrieden ist, ihnen unentgeltlich in den Korb schiebt. Ein solcher schöner Markknochen wird in der französischen Küchensprache "la réjouissance" genannt, und man kocht damit ganz vorzügliche Kraftbrühen, die für einen armen schmachtenden Kranken sehr stärkend und labend sind. Dass ich eine solche réjouissance nicht ablehnte und sie mir vielmehr mit Behagen zu Gemüte führte, wird jeder fühlende Mensch billigen [I, 486].

In the same vein his poem *Fromme Warnung* paints the delights of heaven as consisting of quiet, soft slippers and beautiful music (I, 420). Some of the other poems of the *Romanzero*, however, take a less optimistic view of future prospects. In *Rückschau* the thought of again meeting his "Christian brothers" in the beyond fills him with disgust (I, 416). In *Auferstehung* he rebels against the summary justice of the Supreme Court of the Day of Judgment that would separate men into sheep and goats according to an altogether too convenient formula (I, 417). In *Der Abgekühlte*, again, the prospect of resurrection appears as a rather remote compensation for the lack of joy and comfort here below (I, 420). This mood seems to have gained the upper hand as the years wore on and the calls of death became more frequent and insistent. Then the thought of the separation of body and soul loomed as something

altogether terrible, as in the dialogue between body and soul, where the soul says:

> Weh mir! jetzt soll ich gleichsam nackt,
> Ganz ohne Körper, ganz abstrakt,
> Hinlungern in ein sel'ges Nichts
> Dort oben in dem Reich des Lichts,
> In jenen kalten Himmelshallen,
> Wo schweigend die Ewigkeiten wallen
> Und mich angähnen—sie klappern dabei
> Langweilig mit ihren Pantoffeln von Blei.
> O, das ist grauenhaft, o bleib,
> Bleib bei mir, du geliebter Leib! [II, 91].

To dispel such thoughts Heine had recourse to phantasies like the dialogue with St. Peter at the gate of heaven.

Heine's last word on immortality seems to be contained in one of the poems addressed to his *Mouche*. *Die Wahlverlobten* ends with renunciation of any hope of the continuance of individual existence and tries to derive comfort from the immortality of the poet's works:

> . . . . Wir scheiden heut
> Auf immerdar. Kein Wiedersehn
> Gibt es für uns in Himmelshöhn.
> Die Schönheit ist dem Staub verfallen,
> Du wirst zerstieben, wirst verhallen.
> Viel anders ist es mit Poeten;
> Die kann der Tod nicht gänzlich töten.
> Uns trifft nicht weltliche Vernichtung,
> Wir leben fort im Land der Dichtung,
> In Avalun, dem Feenreiche—
> Leb wohl auf ewig, schöne Leiche! [II, 45].[1]

To be sure, Heine's last letter to his mother (December 30, 1855) expresses the confident hope of reunion, but it is only necessary to recall the fictions to which Heine persistently resorted to conceal from his mother the gravity of his illness, in order to realize that such testimony cannot carry any great weight.

Generally speaking, one cannot venture to say anything very definite about Heine's mental world during the months which marked the last act of the drama of his sufferings. He was too exhausted

[1] But to realize how bitterly Heine felt the inadequacy of such an immortality, one has only to read poems like *Der Scheidende* (II, 109) and *Epilog* (II, 110).

with pain and too benumbed through the huge doses of morphine which his condition required to care much about the future one way or the other. His apathy was general except for the hope that the end would come. He was already a corpse save for a feeble spark of life which put its patience to a last test by its long protracted glow.

> Erstorben ist in meiner Brust
> Jedwede weltlich eitle Lust,
> Schier ist auch mir erstorben drin
> Der Hass des Schlechten, sogar der Sinn
> Für eigne wie für fremde Not—
> Und in mir lebt nur noch der Tod! [II, 109].

As a picture of Heine's inner world since 1848 this sketch is altogether fragmentary, confining itself, as it does, to studying the positive religious transformation that took place in him. A rounded-out picture of Heine's last years would perforce stress in addition both his somber pessimism and his frequent passionate longing for the wild joys of the senses that had ceased to function. Neither his pessimism nor his longings can be logically reconciled with his religious rebirth. They are croppings out of his old self which would not die while there was still breath in his body. Heine remained to the last a complex personality, torn between mutually incompatible desires; a play of cross-currents which he knew not how to unite as tributaries in a life of planful, harmonious purpose.

III

What were the motives which prompted Heine's renunciation of his paganism and his return to God?

In more than one way Heine occupies a unique position among German poets. To a degree not found in any other poet, Heine's productions gravitate about his own personality. Almost every line that he wrote invites psychological analysis, and almost every line furnishes data for such analysis. Despite the complexity of Heine's personality, it becomes a grateful and fascinating task to seek in Heine, behind the bundle of logical contradictions with which his life abounds, the psychological unity in which they had their source. Without any apprehension, therefore, of having to resort to vague

generalities or of getting lost in blind alleys, one may attempt to retrace the psychological paths which led Heine back to God and the morality of his forefathers.

Wish is said to be the father of thought; so it is well to examine, first of all, the considerations which made a world ruled over by an old-fashioned God an acceptable place of abode for Heine, after he had pronounced his *de facto* recognition of God. In moods of grave seriousness mingled with melancholy mirth Heine dwelt with pleasure on the advantages which he derived from the existence of an omnipotent creator, enthroned in heaven. Racked by tortures which could end only with death, shut out from the gay life of the humming metropolis, condemned to a loneliness even more terrible than his sufferings, he derived consolation from the idea that there was a God to whose ear he had access at every moment; that there was someone whom he could talk and pray to; someone whom he could flatter, cajole, entertain, or abuse according to his mood of the moment; someone of whose attention and appreciation he could always feel certain. To quote his own words:

> In diesem Zustande ist es eine wahre Wohltat für mich, dass es jemand im Himmel gibt, dem ich beständig die Litanei meiner Leiden vorwimmern kann, besonders nach Mitternacht, wenn Mathilde sich zur Ruhe begeben, die sie oft sehr nötig hat [VI, 50].

Then he could confide to the Lord his own troubles and his worries as to what should become of his wife, when he could no longer guard her steps nor provide for her wants. To such tender solicitude for Mathilde's material and moral welfare in that wolves' den, Paris (*Babylonische Sorgen*, II, 43)—a solicitude which largely served as a cover for tormenting jealousy—such poems as the touching *Ich war, O Lamm, als Hirt bestellt* owe their being (II, 42). It was also a relief to him, as he jestingly remarks, to be able to intrust his affairs to a heavenly attorney who, thanks to his omniscience, would doubtless be able to manage them much better than he had ever been able to do (VI, 50).

From quite another angle, besides, Heine's return to God had much in its favor. Formerly the profession of atheistic doctrines had been a characteristic of the "intelligentsia." A coterie of aristocrats of the intellect had promulgated them in an abstruse

philosophical language, debarring the comprehension of the populace. But in the course of time the situation had shifted. Thanks to Karl Marx, atheism had now—especially since 1848—become the creed of the workman. It was no longer exclusive, nor a sign of distinction. With this turn of affairs, atheism lost its attraction for Heine. Expressing his realization of this change with startling candor, he remarks:

Als der Atheismus anfing, sehr stark nach Käse, Branntwein und Tabak zu stinken: da gingen mir plötzlich die Augen auf, und was ich nicht durch meinen Verstand begriffen hatte, das begriff ich jetzt durch den Geruchssinn, durch das Missbehagen des Ekels, und mit meinem Atheismus hatte es, gottlob! ein Ende [VI, 42].

To the aid of this aesthetic aversion to mingling with the common herd—intellectually no less than physically—there came also a feeling of anxiety as to the future, when Heine observed the program of communism marching under the banner of atheism. When communism was in its infancy, Heine had helped to proclaim its future mission in pealing verse.[1] Now, however, when the realization of its program no longer seemed altogether utopian, he began to look with fear upon the fledgling which he had helped to hatch. Hastening to protest that his misgivings had nothing in common with those of the capitalist who fears for his dividends, he adds:

Mich beklemmt vielmehr die geheime Angst des Künstlers und des Gelehrten, die wir unsre ganze moderne Zivilisation, die mühselige Errungenschaft so vieler Jahrhunderte, die Frucht der edelsten Arbeiten unsrer Vorgänger, durch den Sieg des Kommunismus bedroht sehen [VI, 42].

And with a flash of insight which illuminates the fundamental nature of his agitation for political democracy, he continues:

Wir wollen gern für das Volk uns opfern, denn Selbstaufopferung gehört zu unsern raffiniertesten Genüssen—die Emanzipation des Volkes war die grosse Aufgabe unseres Lebens, und wir haben dafür gerungen und namenloses Elend ertragen in der Heimat wie im Exile—aber die reinliche, sensitive Natur des Dichters sträubt sich gegen jede persönlich nahe Berührung mit dem Volke, und noch mehr schrecken wir zusammen bei dem Gedanken an seine Liebkosungen, vor denen uns Gott bewahre [VI, 42].

Heine had taken pride in the rôle of a political spokesman, formulating the aspirations of the people. Condescending to lead, he

[1] Cf. *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen*, II, 431–33.

had enjoyed this form of "self-sacrifice," as he calls it. But now that the people knew what they wanted, the day of such leaders was over. When the one-time leaders were summoned to fall in line and march with the rest, Heine withdrew. He had not meant equality to be taken so literally. He suddenly saw that the aspirations of the new generation, their discipline, their unerring *Zielbewusstsein* left no room for his own romantic subjectivism. He would not follow them; they paid no heed to him. And suddenly he became aware that the tables were turned, that atheism was now the vogue of the day, and that it was again a sign of distinction to render homage to the God who had been deposed by the noisy crowd. His newly found faith restored to Heine that sense of superiority, that isolation of genius which he craved from the depths of his nature. Now he did not feel as one left behind in the march of progress. He felt as one on a peak whose eye reaches far beyond the goal of the noisy marchers below.

The consolation, the security and the entertainment that Heine felt in communing with his God; the feeling of aristocratic isolation which his renunciation of atheism involved—one will do well to regard these rather as benefits resulting from Heine's return to God than as motives prompting that return. Such they were certainly in Heine's own estimation; for he leaves no doubt as to what he regarded as the chief factor prompting his spiritual transformation. Repudiating anything that savored of conversion by miracle, he attributes his change of viewpoint solely to the Bible:

> In der Tat, weder eine Vision, noch eine seraphitische Verzückung, noch eine Stimme vom Himmel, auch kein merkwürdiger Traum oder sonst ein Wunderspuk brachte mich auf den Weg des Heils, und ich verdanke meine Erleuchtung ganz einfach der Lektüre eines Buches. Eines Buches? Ja, und es ist ein altes, schlichtes Buch, bescheiden wie die Natur, auch natürlich wie diese; ein Buch, das werkeltägig und anspruchslos aussieht wie die Sonne, die uns wärmt, wie das Brot, das uns nährt; ein Buch, das so traulich, so segnend gütig uns anblickt wie eine alte Grossmutter, die auch täglich in dem Buche liest, mit den lieben, bebenden Lippen und mit der Brille auf der Nase—und dieses Buch heisst auch ganz kurzweg das Buch, die Bibel [Preface to the second edition of *Religion and Philosophy in Germany* (1852), IV, 159; cf. VI, 54].

This fine tribute is altogether in keeping with Heine's reawakened love for the culture of his forefathers, the more so as his praise goes

out whole-heartedly only to the Old Testament in contrast to the New, which at times offended his aesthetic sense by its wholesale chastisements (VI, 54). As the loftiest monument of the lore of his ancient race, the Bible kindled his imagination.

But this was not the first time that the Bible had entered into Heine's life as a real experience. Under very different circumstances, twenty years earlier, on the island of Helgoland, he had read the Bible with open eyes and been impressed by its grandeur. At that time also the naïve simplicity of its style had elicited from him a tribute of unreserved praise, without, however, disturbing his frank paganism (VII, 46, 52). Then he had read it as a literary masterpiece; now he read it as a religious message.

So the question remains, Why did Heine now approach the Bible in a religious frame of mind? It was not a case of Heine's suddenly and unexpectedly finding his God in the Bible. Like the prodigal son, as it were, he had turned his back on the pagan world and started on his search for God. In this search he did not stumble on the Bible. He went straight toward it, knowing that he would find his God there.

Obviously, to rest content with the statement that the Bible brought Heine back to God would be to evade the problem, since his study of the Bible marked rather the end than the beginning of his religious transformation. With the problem thus defined but not solved, the real task is to trace Heine's religious attitude to its source; to seek the conditions that encouraged its growth in the basic impulses which constituted the driving forces of Heine's personality. Instead of asking what outside forces or circumstances prompted Heine's return to God, one must rather ask what elements of his make-up made Heine susceptible to religious ideas and sentiments, provided there was a combination of circumstances favoring such a turn.

It is necessary to scrutinize Heine's life with a view to probing how deeply any convictions on philosophical, religious, political, and social questions permeated Heine's being; how far the tentacles of any of Heine's theoretical beliefs reached into his personality and how firmly they were imbedded in it. For if it should become apparent that philosophical, religious, political, or social issues, as

such, did not touch the basic stratum of Heine's personality at all, the solution of the question at issue would, in the nature of the case, be a great deal nearer.

Frankly—though it involves anticipation—a dispassionate study of Heine the man forces one to the unqualified conclusion that theoretical issues of any kind whatever did not touch the core of his personality. To put it briefly and in the form of an ethical thesis: Heine lacked intellectual integrity of the highest order.

Barring the ethical significance of this observation, Heine himself, with his customary keenness of vision, felt a certain air of unreality pervading all the issues on which he took sides as a spirited fighter. He enjoyed the clash of intellects; he exulted in the sparks that were drawn in the encounter of mind with mind; he loved the spectacle of conflict—so much so that the sight of it would lull him into a state of dreamy abstraction and make him forget for the moment what it was all about. Waking up from his revery he would realize that he was a dreamer rather than a fighter by temperament; that while others were fighting beside him in the white heat of passion, he fought in the mood of aesthetic play. His awareness of this mood is admirably shown in a passage dating, it must be remembered, from the days when Heine was still a good fighter:

> Von Natur neige ich mich zu einem gewissen *dolce far niente* und ich lagere mich gern auf blumige Rasen und betrachte dann die ruhigen Züge der Wolken und ergötze mich an ihrer Beleuchtung; doch der Zufall wollte, dass ich aus dieser gemächlichen Träumerei sehr oft durch harte Rippenstösse des Schicksals geweckt wurde, und ich musste gezwungenerweise teilnehmen an den Schmerzen und Kämpfen der Zeit, und ehrlich war dann meine Teilnahme, und ich schlug mich trotz den Tapfersten. . . . . Aber ich weiss nicht, wie ich mich ausdrücken soll, meine Empfindungen behielten doch immer eine gewisse Abgeschiedenheit von den Empfindungen der anderen; ich wusste wie ihnen zu Mute war, aber mir war ganz anders zu Mute wie ihnen; und wenn ich mein Schlachtross auch noch so rüstig tummelte und mit dem Schwert auch noch so gnadenlos auf die Feinde einhieb, so erfasste mich doch nie das Fieber oder die Lust oder die Angst der Schlacht; ob meiner inneren Ruhe ward mir oft unheimlich zu Sinne, ich merkte, dass die Gedanken anderörtig verweilten, während ich im dichtesten Gedränge des Parteikriegs mich herumschlug, und ich kam mir manchmal vor wie Ogier der Däne, welcher traumwandelnd gegen die Sarazenen focht [*Über die französische Bühne* (1837), IV, 542].

The same mood prevails in his poem *Ali Bei* (1839), in which he masquerades as a Saracen fighting the crusaders:

Und der Held besteigt sein Schlachtross,
Fliegt zum Kampf, doch wie im Traume;
Denn ihm ist zu Sinn als läg' er
Immer noch in Mädchenarmen.

Während er die Frankenköpfe
Dutzendweis heruntersäbelt,
Lächelt er wie ein Verliebter,
Ja, er lächelt sanft und zärtlich [I, 278].

It is also expressed in the opening paragraph of his *Helgolandbriefe* (1830?) (VII, 42), and it comes again to the fore in a letter to St. René Taillandier of November 21, 1851:

Selbst ehedem, als ich gesund war, hatte die Begeisterung der Deutschen für mich etwas Erschreckendes, das schlecht zu einer gewissen träumerischen Grandezza passte, die in meiner Natur liegt.[1]

It might be objected that this mood of the unreality of conflict was limited to issues of a political nature; but such doubts cannot stand in the face of the testimony of Heine's *Geständnisse*. There he comments on the end of his warfare against the Roman Catholic church as follows:

Ich habe längst aller Befehdung derselben entsagt, und längst ruht in der Scheide das Schwert, das ich einst zog im Dienste einer Idee und nicht einer Privatleidenschaft. Ja, ich war in diesem Kampf gleichsam ein *officier de fortune*, der sich brav schlägt aber nach der Schlacht oder nach dem Scharmützel keinen Tropfen Groll im Herzen bewahrt, weder gegen die bekämpfte Sache noch gegen ihre Vertreter [VI, 66].

Almost in the same breath, with the issues of Liberalism and Jesuitism in mind, he makes a confession which does greater credit to his faculty of self-analysis than to his intellectual integrity:

Und dann, ohne im geringsten die Hut meiner Parteiinteressen zu verabsäumen, musste ich mir in der Besonnenheit meines Gemütes zuweilen gestehen, wie es oft von den kleinsten Zufälligkeiten abhing, dass wir dieser statt jener Partei zufielen und uns jetzt nicht in einem ganz entgegengesetzten Feldlager befänden [VI, 68].

[1] Cf. also the conclusion to chap. xxix of the *Reise von München nach Genua*, III, 276.

Expatiating on the fortuitous character of his development, Heine then indulges in fond speculations as to what his career might have been if his mother, who displayed a great deal of both initiative and opportunism in determining upon the lines of his early training (VII, 463–65), had followed one of the many alternatives under consideration and consecrated him to the service of the Catholic church. Picturing himself in the rôle of a Roman "abbate," a Papal *nuntio*, a cardinal, or even that of the pope himself, he notes with satisfaction that such a career would have afforded him ample opportunity to display his talents as a patron of art and beauty. Moreover, he would have performed his clerical duties with an inborn sense of the solemn gravity and aesthetic dignity consonant with such a position. With a mien of imperturbable, sacerdotal seriousness, heightened by the splendor of his gorgeous vestments and the impressiveness of his ecclesiastical retinue, he would have bestowed the annual blessing upon the whole Christendom, "denn ich kann sehr ernst sein, wenn es durchaus nötig ist" (VI, 69–71). How this trend of thought captivated Heine's fancy is shown by the fact that in his *Memoirs* he indulged in dreams of a similar vein, as is still apparent despite the fact that their substance, among other matters, fell a victim to his cousin's ruthless censorship (cf. VII, 460, 466).

If the foregoing data have established the view that social, political, philosophical, and religious issues failed to touch the core of Heine's personality, his late recantation on matters of religion and morals must appear to presuppose less of a psychic revolution than would otherwise have been the case. Then it is clear that Heine's fundamental self was not affected by his return to God.

From this point of approach one is also able to understand how from first to last Heine could maintain in the most emphatic terms that his whole mental life presented a picture of consistent mental unity, in spite of its glaring contradictions, and how he could insist that inner unity was an indispensable condition to spiritual greatness. One recalls Heine's early claim to unity, couched in Hegelian terms, as formulated in his correspondence with his friend Moser.[1]

[1] For example on November 27, 1823, Heine says that he expects to show "wie mein ganzes, trübes, drangvolles Leben in das Uneigennützigste, in die Idee, übergeht."

One meets it again in the Preface to the second edition of the *Buch der Lieder* (1837).[1] In his *Börne* he repeats this claim by implication in the statement "dass ohne innere Einheit keine geistige Grösse möglich ist" (VII, 135). And finally, after the *Geständnisse* had been given to the world, Heine reiterates it in such a way as to show plainly that his sense of inner unity had remained intact despite the collapse of his paganism. Writing to Campe, he comments on his latest productions as follows:

> Diese Poesien sind etwas ganz Neues und geben keine alten Stimmungen in alter Manier; aber zu ihrer Würdigung sind nur die ganz naiven Naturen und die ganz grossen Kritiker berufen. Die Geständnisse sind ebenfalls nicht jedem zugänglich, doch sind sie wichtig, indem die Einheit aller meiner Werke und meines Lebens besser begriffen wird [August 3, 1854].

What a tenacious sense of unity for a poet whose life presents the classical example of *Zerrissenheit!* This sense of unity despite contradiction is so startling a trait of Heine's nature that an understanding of its basis may well furnish the key to Heine's whole personality. It may even bear out Heine's contention that his return to God was but a phase of a consistent process of evolution.

The more one scrutinizes Heine's life, the more impossible does it become to base his sense of unity on any logical unity of life-long plan and purpose. Moreover, had there been any such rational unity, Heine would have undoubtedly given it a clear-cut formulation. All the facts tend to show that Heine rather had in mind a strong sense of continuity which he confused with consistency, and that he spoke of unity where consistency would have been the only appropriate term (as is at least the case in the above-quoted letter to Campe) solely because, in spite of himself, he still talked the language of Hegelianism which interpreted the world as a *logical* phenomenon.

I hold, however, the view that Heine's life presents, in fact, a marked psychological continuity, apart from the formal unity which the life of every individual involves in so far as it is the totality of experience bound up with a single body. I would formulate the continuity pervading Heine's life as follows:

[1] "Bemerken muss ich jedoch, dass meine poetischen, eben so gut wie meine politischen, theologischen und philosophischen Schriften einem und demselben Gedanken entsprossen sind . . . . (I, 497).

Heine was from first to last a modern Narcissus, enamored of his own image.[1] The world of nature and the world of men was to him a vast many-sided mirror in which he always beheld himself with infinite pleasure. He felt a tenderness, a fondness, a compassion, an admiration toward his own soul amounting to worship. He loved his body with equal fervor. His hands, his eyes, his lips, his forehead were objects on which he lavished his affection. He was enamored of the sweet odor of his body. Besides loving himself, he craved the personal flattery of others. To his inmost self his art and the fame it brought him were essentially personal ornaments—accomplishments that graced his personality. The political arena was to him but a stage where he could strike a heroic pose and drape his garment about him in the most becoming folds. And all this with the naïve self-assurance, the graceful poise of the born aesthete who knows he cannot help but please!

This extraordinary self-love is exposed to full view in his two earliest letters to his friend Sethe (July 6 and October 27, 1816). It is the ever-recurrent theme of his early love poetry. It explains the fearful nature of the crisis that broke when the object which he had singled out for his love dared not to return it. It is the center of the complex from which the sadistic and masochistic visions of the *Almansor* and *Ratcliff* detached themselves. It is the one firm thread that holds together the ramblings of his *Reisebilder* and gives their characteristic flavor—and most piquant charm—to all his subsequent writings. And this love of his person—his body as well as his soul—never parted company with Heine during the long years of his martyrdom.

To lay bare Heine's Narcissus-love in full would require a substantial monograph in itself, but as Heine's ostentatious coquetry with his person has so often been pointed out by both benevolent and hostile critics, this general statement may suffice here. It seems to me, however, that in the interpretation of Heine's personality this peculiar form of "autoerotism" has never received

[1] Narcissism is clearly recognized by students of sex pathology such as Krafft-Ebing, Havelock Ellis, Freud, etc., as one of the types of sexual inversion—psychic as well as physical. The term "Narcissism" is borrowed from the familiar Greek myth of the youth Narcissus who fell in love with his own image, mirrored in the water.

sufficiently serious consideration; for it appears to me such a fundamental trait of his nature that its manifestation was as natural to Heine and as automatic almost as the act of breathing. This love of his person was so intimately real to Heine, that beside it all "issues" paled into unreality.

Examples could be multiplied to show how Heine's Narcissus-love maintained itself undimmed to the end, but I think the analysis of a single one will suffice. I have in mind Heine's sketch of his father in his *Memoirs*. Written almost thirty years after his father's death, it can lay no claim to realistic accuracy. It is all the more valuable on that account as revealing the workings of the fancy that retouched the portrait.

Heine says that he loved his father most of all human beings. His pen portrait is therefore bound to render the characteristic traits that made his memory so beloved to his son. It is bound to reproduce qualities which in their combination impressed Heine as supremely winning and lovable. Analysis will show that the very qualities which made him treasure his father's memory were also most deeply rooted in his own nature. Quite unconsciously, perhaps, he superposed his own image upon that of his father in recording the impression of his father's temperament which lingered in his mind. One must read that sketch in its entirety (*Memoiren*, VII, 482–511) to appreciate in full how the traits that constituted Heine's being are here rendered in a more primitive eighteenth-century setting, in a modest environment of the *petite bourgeosie*.

His father, as Heine remembers him, was endowed with a boundless joyousness of temperament. "Er war genusssüchtig, frohsinnig, rosenlaunig. . . . . Immer himmelblaue Heiterkeit und Fanfaren des Leichtsinns." In apparent contradiction with this lightheartedness stood a self-conscious, dignified gravity of deportment, a pose of solemnity and importance, which, though genuine, gave the most piquant flavor to his personality. "Jene Gravität war zwar nicht erborgt, aber sie erinnerte doch an jene antiken Basreliefs, wo ein heiteres Kind sich eine grosse tragische Maske vor das Antlitz hält." He had, in fact, the naïve simplicity of a child, combining with it a surprising depth of intuition. The quality of his voice enhanced this childlike character, suggesting forest sounds to Heine

by its peculiar timber. Consonant with the gravity of his demeanor was the sedulous care which he bestowed upon his body. In recalling the immaculate whiteness of his finely chiseled hand and the delicate flavor of almonds which emanated from it when Heine stooped to kiss it, he is almost moved to tears.

To this big eighteenth-century child, life was a great game in which he was absorbed with the same seriousness as a child in its play. Even his business was but a phase of this great make-believe game of seriousness. "Seine Tätigkeit war eigentlich nur eine unaufhörliche Geschäftigkeit." His trade in velveteens was managed not like a business but like a hobby. Uppermost in his mind was not a desire to profit but a desire to please.

This desire to please led him to practice the most generous liberality toward the poor of Düsseldorf. He gave with an open hand, and in his giving he displayed such intuitive tact and courtesy that he won the love of all the old mendicant women whose lot he lightened. But in addition he won their flattery, and this made him as happy as a king. The love of flattery was his most amiable weakness.

> Da nun für schöne Männer, deren Spezialität darin besteht, dass sie schöne Männer sind, die Schmeichelei ein grosses Bedürfnis ist, und es ihnen dabei gleichgültig ist, ob der Weihrauch aus einem rosichten oder welken Munde kommt, wenn er nur stark und reinlich hervorquillt, so begreift man, wie mein teurer Vater, ohne eben darauf spekuliert zu haben, dennoch in seinem Verkehr mit den alten Damen ein gutes Geschäft machte.
>
> Es ist unbegreiflich, wie gross oft die Dosis Weihrauch war, mit welcher sie ihn eindampften, und wie gut er die stärkste Portion vertragen konnte. Das war sein glückliches Temperament, durchaus nicht Einfalt. Er wusste sehr wohl, dass man ihm schmeichelte, aber er wusste auch, dass Schmeichelei wie Zucker immer süss ist, und er war wie das Kind, welches zu der Mutter sagt: Schmeichle mir ein bischen, sogar ein bischen zu viel [VII, 495].

If Heine's sketch of his father presents with any degree of fidelity the character of his parent, then it is obvious that the father was a complete impersonation of the Narcissus-type; then it appears also that it was either a hereditary predisposition or the force of example which fostered a similar development in his son. Quite apart, however, from any such hypothesis, the love with which Heine dwells on his father's smiling good humor, on his childlike gravity

of deportment, on his sedulous attention to his body, on his sense of unreality, face to face with the serious business of the world, on his liberality, his tact, his politeness, and on his craving for personal flattery—all this accentuates in the most striking manner the Narcissus-character of Heine's own temperament. Heine does not record these qualities of his father with any air of detachment; he does not assume the superior attitude of the benevolent critic. He speaks of them as one who is charmed by them to the utmost degree; as one who regards them as priceless treasures. He speaks as one who knows them not by observation from without but by intuition from within.[1]

It seems to me that Heine's Narcissus-character provided a natural bridge by means of which the transition from paganism to religious inwardness took place.

In 1848 the time had arrived when Heine could no longer conceal from himself the fact that his days of joy were numbered. He had had ample warning. The first signs of paralysis had made themselves felt in the early thirties. In 1843 matters became worse. For long periods physicians were in constant attendance. In 1845 the news of his uncle's will, which left him a miserable pittance instead of the comfortable annuity he had expected, precipitated a crisis. Death seemed imminent, but his nature triumphed. But then followed the long tenacious struggle in which, with the power lent by hate, Heine pitted all his resources against his relatives in order to compel them by fair means or foul, by flattery, by negotiation, by intimidation and public defamation to guarantee him the pension which he had enjoyed during his uncle's lifetime. He won out, but not before the poison of hate had done its deadly work upon his body. In 1848 he was a hopeless paralytic, facing death as the only hope of liberation from his tortures.

He could no longer pursue the enjoyment in which he had reveled. He could no longer pose as Bacchus, glorying in wine and sensuous beauty. But he still loved himself with all the passionate ardor of which his being was capable. He still loved his decrepit, enfeebled body, but he wanted to think of it as beautiful and pleasing

[1] Is there a more exquisite Narcissus fancy conceivable than Heine's picturing himself arrayed in the pontifical robes?

to the last. But with his eye set upon the beauty of robust health and bodily vigor—how could his helpless, wasted body help but revolt all his aesthetic sensibilities! The Hellenism which he had so exultantly proclaimed demanded that he avert his gaze from himself in pitying silence.

This situation brought Heine face to face with the most trying crisis of his life. Either that fondly nursed love for his bodily self must be uprooted, or he must abandon the aesthetic ideals which were his most characteristic contribution to the life of his age. He must either be true to his past self and await death in stoic blindness, or he must cast his past aside and embrace a new ideal of beauty with which to make something harmonious, noble, impressive, beautiful, winning, and lovable even out of the wreckage of his body. The crisis lasted until he knew that his fate was sealed. Then his self irresistibly gravitated toward the latter alternative.

Thus a mood of grave, tranquil, sometimes somber seriousness instinctively began to replace in Heine's heart the light-hearted laughter of his former days, as becoming to his altered status. Sallies of wit, choice conceits, bizarre anachronisms, flashes of fantastic humor adorn his language as of old—but now they occur as quaint arabesques traced against a background of solemn gravity. The poetry of the *Romanzero*, and the last poems, is that of a sage whose dying body is transfigured with a spiritual beauty. The seriousness of death pervades the very technique of Heine's most characteristic last productions, such as *Vitzliputzli*, *Spanische Atriden*, *Prinzessin Sabbath*, *Jehuda ben Halevy*, and *Bimini*. Here the concentration of Heine's earlier poetry is entirely wanting. There is none of the economy that makes for epigrammatic conclusions. The progression is leisurely; transitions are lengthy. There is frequent repetition without the character of refrain. Similes and metaphors trail and ramble without the least effort at compression. The rhymeless verse has not a trace of rhetorical pathos. It progresses with the calm precision of the most finely chiseled prose, in which no sound can be slurred without marring the euphony of the whole. The vocalic richness and often the very length of the exotic words with which the lines are studded add to their impressiveness. All haste is absent. Here is the grave leisurely calm,

the complete self-possession, the serene poise of the consummate self-conscious artist whose words bear the message of spiritual beauty. And the beauty of these poems casts its reflection on the bodily form of the heroic sufferer whose trembling hand traced out their perfect lines in the intervals of his agony. His pallid, bearded face with the half-closed eyelids appears more lovable than did ever the rosy countenance of Bacchus.

To speak of this mood of grave dignity which gradually superseded the wanton laughter of happier days as a pose, were to miss its true character. Pose implies conscious affectation, whereas here is an attitude which grew spontaneously out of the roots of Heine's being. One recalls how Heine's conscious self at first viewed with alarm the change preparing within him. On the other hand, Heine's sense of unreality in regard to issues applies equally to this sustained mood of solemn seriousness.

Steeped as Heine was in the atmosphere of this mood, the rebirth of his love for Judaism followed as a natural development. At the time of his Hellenism the Greek ideal had stood for joy, and Judaism had faced it frowning with the scowl of harsh asceticism. When there was no longer any room for joy, the contrast between the two great types of human ideals remained as pronounced as ever, but by a slight shifting of the point of view the harsh asceticism of Judaism softened into lofty sublimity.[1] As such it had assumed the aspect of an aesthetic phenomenon, inviting Heine's loving contemplation. He could now lose himself in the contemplation of the morality which was the essence of Judaism, not as a practical but as an aesthetic phenomenon on a par with the sensuous beauty of Greece. When Heine was still among the living, morality had faced him as an unlovely practical imperative; now, when only a feeble spark of life retarded the total dissolution of his body, morality was only a phenomenon passing before the mind's eye, no longer threatening with any practical demands upon his extinguished senses. Thus his Narcissus-love which prescribed grave solemnity as the becoming gesture of death turned his aesthetic contemplation upon a sphere where solemn seriousness reigned with undisputed sway. As

[1] The reader will recall that this transition is suggested by Kant's dichotomy of the aesthetic into the "beautiful" and the "sublime."

a poet to whom every idea transformed itself into a concrete symbolical vision, Heine expressed the quintessence of Judaism in the words: "Israel sass fromm unter seinem Feigenbaum und sang das Lob des unsichtbaren Gottes" (VI, 61).[1]

If the symbolism of this passage has made it strikingly clear that morality appealed to Heine as an aesthetic attitude and by no means as a practical postulate, it requires little imaginative insight to see that this aesthetic morality would have been meaningless without a God. Being essentially a contemplative worship of divine beauty, it would have been empty without a divine creator responsive to human adoration. There was more than mere affectation in the horror with which Heine twenty years earlier had discussed Fichte's sternly practical postulate of morality in which God was replaced by the abstract concept of law. At that time he had written: "Der Fichtesche Idealismus gehört zu den kolossalsten Irrtümern, die jemals der menschliche Geist ausgeheckt. Er ist gottloser und verdammlicher als der plumpste Materialismus. So viel weiss ich, beide sind mir zuwider." And he had added: "Beide Ansichten sind auch antipoetisch" (IV, 276). If at that time a *moral* world without a God impressed Heine as monstrous and unpoetical, how much more must this have been the case now, when he identified himself with the spiritual beauty of Judaism which turned about the adoration of the Creator. The God of his forefathers satisfied his poet's craving for the tangible and the concrete. And true to his Narcissus-self in all things he retouched the portrait of the God of his fathers in conformity with his own image, making of him, as it were, a divine Narcissus.

[1] To appreciate the significance of this image one must bear in mind that Heine's imagination automatically concentrated the quintessence of a situation into a dramatic gesture. Helene Herrmann has pointed out the prevalence of "Die Geste des Untergangs" in the *Romanzero*. I quote a few striking examples of the dramatic gesture from other contexts:

"Es ist, als ob Rahel wusste, welche posthume Sendung ihr beschieden war. Sie glaubte freilich es würde besser werden und wartete; doch als des Wartens kein Ende nahm, schüttelte sie ungeduldig den Kopf, sah Varnhagen an, und starb schnell—um desto schneller auferstehn zu können" (I, 497).

Speaking of his failure to defend himself in 1848 against the insinuation that he had been bought by the French government: "Wer einen schönen Mantel besass, verhüllte darin sein Antlitz" (VI, 374).

On the abdication of Louis Philippe: "Als es galt, auf das Volk schiessen zu lassen, überschlich ihn die alte philanthropische Weichherzigkeit, und er warf die Krone von sich, ergriff seinen Hut und nahm seinen alten Regenschirm und seine Frau unter den Arm, und empfahl sich" (VI, 539).

The intimate interpenetration of religious emotion and Narcissus-love in Heine's inner world found its most beautiful expression in the *Jehuda ben Halevy* of the *Hebrew Melodies*. The hero of the poem is ostensibly a pious Jewish poet of medieval Spain, but in reality the portrait of Jehuda bears Heine's own idealized features. Such lines as

Ich erkannt' ihn an der bleichen
Und gedankenstolzen Stirne,
An der Augen süsser Starrheit—
Sahn mich an so schmerzlich forschend—

Doch zumeist erkannt' ich ihn
An dem rätselhaften Lächeln
Jener schön gereimten Lippen,
Die man nur bei Dichtern findet [I, 438],

show Heine contemplating his own countenance transfigured with spiritual beauty. And in the following lines the sudden transition from the third person to the first removes even the thin veil of fiction:

Rein und wahrhaft, sonder Makel
War sein Lied, wie seine Seele—
Als der Schöpfer sie erschaffen,
Diese Seele, selbstzufrieden

Küsste er die schöne Seele,
Und des Kusses holder Nachklang
Bebt in jedem Lied des Dichters,
Das geweiht durch diese Gnade.

Wie im Leben, so im Dichten
Ist das höchste Gut die Gnade—
Wer sie hat, der kann nicht sünd'gen
Nicht in Versen, noch in Prosa.

Solchen Dichter von der Gnade
Gottes nennen wir Genie;
Unverantwortlicher König
Des Gedankenreiches ist er.

Nur dem Gotte steht er Rede,
Nicht dem Volke—In der Kunst,
Wie im Leben kann das Volk
Töten uns, doch niemals richten [I, 443].

Has ever poet conceived a more far-reaching apotheosis of his soul and of his art!

And when Heine extols the song of Jehuda as costlier than priceless pearls, to what songs but his own does he pay this tribute!

Doch die Perlen hier im Kästchen
Sind entquollen einer schönen
Menschenseele, die noch tiefer,
Abgrundtiefer als das Weltmeer—

Denn es sind die Thränenperlen
Des Jehuda ben Halevy,
Die er ob dem Untergang
Von Jerusalem geweinet—

Perlenthränen, die verbunden
Durch des Reimes goldnen Faden,
Aus der Dichtkunst güldnen Schmiede
Als ein Lied hervorgegangen [I, 454].

Perhaps here the destruction of Jerusalem is even felt as a symbol of the destruction of the splendid temple of his body. But Heine's Narcissus-love reaches its climax in the delicious picture of the martyred poet's reception into heaven:

Droben, heisst es, harrte seiner
Ein Empfang, der schmeichelhaft
Ganz besonders für den Dichter,
Eine himmlische Sürprise.

Festlich kam das Chor der Engel
Ihm entgegen mit Musik,
Und als Hymne grüssten ihn
Seine eignen Verse, jenes.

Synagogen-Hochzeitskarmen,
Jene Sabbath-Hymenäen,
Mit den jauchzend wohlbekannten
Melodien—welche Töne!

Englein bliesen auf Hoboen,
Englein spielten Violine,
Andre strichen auch die Bratsche
Oder schlugen Pauk' und Zimbel.

Und das sang und klang so lieblich,
Und so lieblich in den weiten
Himmelshallen widerhallt es;
Lecho Daudi Likras Kalle [I, 456].

What a priceless comfort the presence of such a thoughtful father in heaven must have been to the dying poet! What a precious part of his soul unfolded itself at the price of those years of agony!

The Narcissus-complex of Heine's personality has revealed itself as the force that brought the poet back to God. What seemed at first a perplexing puzzle, devoid of inner logic, at best an irrational caprice, has taken on the aspect of a gradual psychological development. It has become apparent that Heine's return to God did not involve the disintegration of his inmost self. His real self triumphed over all adversities and maintained itself to the last.

Pathologists tell us that all inversions of the sex impulse, psychic as well as physical, have their roots in the life of the child. They involve a stoppage of the normal development and a fixation of the character of childhood.[1] Thus Heine's Narcissus-character reveals him as a perpetual child. He was a great child in his attitude toward the serious issues of life, despite his wonderful art. In his childlikeness lies the secret of his greatness as well as that of his limitations. His child's quickness of perception, his child's keenness of intuition, and his childlike frankness made him at the same time the most colorful and the most subtly introspective of Romantic poets. But his childlike instinct for play rendered him unfit for the task of solving any of the serious social or religious problems of civilization.

HERMANN J. WEIGAND
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

[1] Recent psychology has tended to see in conversion a reversion to the mental life of the child (cf. A. Adler, *The Neurotic Constitution*, [London, 1919]). At first sight this view would seem not to apply in the case of Heine's gravitation toward religion, since the environment of his childhood did not favor the cultivation of any deep religiosity—Jewish, Catholic, and free-thinking influences pouring in upon him in quick succession. Strictly speaking, therefore, the religious life of his childhood can not be said to have re-emerged. Nevertheless, if it is true that Heine's Narcissus-love prompted his return to God, it follows that here also it was a childhood complex which conditioned the transformation.

N HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED POEM BY FRIEDRICH VON SCHILLER

In the summer of 1904 I purchased of Friedrich Strobel in Jena an album of prose and verse, in the handwriting of Caroline Junot (née Schiller), the oldest daughter of Friedrich Schiller. Among other interesting jottings and fragments, it contains the following hitherto unpublished poem, ascribed by the author of the album to her father. There appears no valid reason for doubting the genuineness of the poem, which Caroline designates specifically as *unpublished*, however difficult it may be to fix the date of its composition:

Ist's ein Geschenk, dasz an den Staub gekettet
Wir durch den Wink des Unerforschten sind?
Wenn er uns nicht von der Vernichtung rettet,
In die des Lebens letzter Hauch verrinnt?

Ist's ein Geschenk, ein Leben, das im Werden
Schon winselnd mit des Todes Schrecken ringt?
Wenn nicht die Zukunft nach dem Kampf auf Erden
Uns tröstend wie die Morgenröte winkt?

Wenn nicht für vieles unverdientes Leiden
Zum süszen Lohn der Ewige uns weckt?
Wenn nicht den Schurken im Genusz der Freuden
Der Zukunft Donnerstimme niederschreckt?

Der Geist versinkt in diesem Zweifelmeere.
Kein milder Stern in dieser dunkeln Nacht.
Wer kennt den Kompasz, der den Pfad uns lehre
Zu jenem Lande, das der Tod bewacht?

Du, sanfter Glaube, von Vernunft geleitet,
Du, ew'ger Führer auf der finstern Bahn,
Nur du hast die Versich'rung mir bereitet,
Dasz ich des künft'gen Seins mich freuen kann.

Du hellst die dunkeln Zweifel meiner Seele,
Du leitest aus dem Irrsal meinen Geist,
Du siehst es, dasz ich mich vergebens quäle,
Da alles hin auf ew'ge Dauer weist.

Du lösest das geheimnisvolle Siegel,
Das uns das Buch der Ewigkeit verschlieszt;
Du zeigest uns der Gottheit heil'gen Spiegel,
Wo uns die Blume schöner Zukunft sprieszt.

The argumentative religious tone of these lines points to their early composition as an expression of the poet's view of human life. They are apparently an elaborate formulation of the thought contained in Schiller's four-line epigram, copied by the poet's brother-in-law, Reinwald, and contained in Christophine's posthumous papers. This epigram, published by Bellermann (*Schillers Werke*, IX, 66) as No. 32, *Zuversicht der Unsterblichkeit*, in the *Anthologie auf das Jahr 1782*, reads as follows:

Zum neuen Leben ist der Tote hier entstanden,
Das weisz und glaub' ich festiglich,
Mich lehren's schon die Weisen ahnden,
Und Schurken überzeugen mich.

The common argument for personal immortality, based upon the need of another life for the divine punishment of the prosperously and joyously wicked in this life (cf. the third stanza of the poem and the final line of the epigram) suggests a genetic connection between the two expressions of religious faith. The epigram is terser and artistically maturer than the stanzas of the poem. Without attempting to fix more definitely the date of either, I am inclined to regard the epigram as Schiller's later and final formulation of the thought of the earlier poem.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

S·7

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *November 1920* NUMBER 7

LA CALPRENÈDE DRAMATIST. II

A cursory glance at the tragi-comedy called *Edouard* indicates that it has to do with incidents from the life of Edward III of England. The king, falling in love with Elips, Countess of Salisbury, seeks to use her father, an honorable old man and distinguished warrior, as a go-between. After a struggle between his honor and his fidelity to the king, he takes Edward's proposition to his daughter, who refuses to yield, much to her father's gratification. Isabella, the queen mother, and Mortimer, her lover, plot to overthrow the influence of Elips, in whose honor the Order of the Garter has been established. To make her leave court they warn her that Edward is preparing to use force. She replies that she always carries a dagger, with which she will kill herself if it is necessary. Taking advantage of her confidence, Mortimer tells Edward that she is seeking his life and that a weapon will be found if she is searched. Thereupon the king tells her of his suspicions and confirms them by the discovery of a dagger in her sleeve.

The fourth act is devoted to the deliberation of Edward and his lords as to the guilt of the countess and her father. The king offers to pardon both if she will yield to him, but his offer is refused. Finally the countess explains to the king why she had the dagger. He is at once convinced of her innocence. Mortimer, forced to

confess, is sent to execution. Edward orders his mother to her home, where she will be guarded, and announces that he will marry the virtuous Elips.

Departures from history are obvious. Edward was already married to Philippa when he met the Countess of Salisbury. Mortimer was executed and Isabella kept at home for a very different reason from the one here given. The story of the dagger is not found in accounts of Edward III. There are, however, historical elements in the play. The marriage of an English king with a woman, not of royal birth, whom he had tried in vain to seduce is true, not of Edward III, but of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville. Froissart,[1] following Jehan le Bel,[2] relates that Edward III, visiting a castle which the Countess of Salisbury had bravely defended against the Scots during her husband's absence in France, fell very much in love with her, but that his advances were repelled. This anecdote, amplified by suggestions furnished, perhaps, by the marriage of Edward IV, provides the material for one of Bandello's *novelle*,[3] repeated by Boisteau,[4] who changes the heroine's name, perhaps on account of a careless reading, to Oelips. Finding the story brief, La Calprenède added the plotting of Mortimer and Isabella, whose relations and whose fate are described by Froissart. He omitted the countess' mother, whose rôle would have appeared odious on the stage, and began after the death of the earl. Half his play is new. Influenced, perhaps, by the success of his other plays with English plots, he added trial scenes and English nobles, two of whose names, Glocester and Norfolk, he had already employed in *Ieanne d'Angleterre*.

The plot is poorly constructed, for the dénouement depends entirely on Edward's decision to pardon and marry the countess, which is the result of her confession. There is little reason why this confession could not be made as soon as the supposed purpose to

[1] Book I, Part I, chaps. clxv–clxviii, cxci, cxcii. The execution of Mortimer and the imprisonment of Isabella are described in chap. 1 of the same part.

[2] *Chronique*, chaps. l and lxv. Le Bel is less near La Calprenède than Froissart is, for in his version the countess is finally raped by the king.

[3] Seconda Parte, Novella xxxvii; cf. G. Lebau, *König Edward III von England und die Gräfin von Salisbury* (Berlin, 1900).

[4] *Histoires tragiques* (Paris, 1660), first story.

kill the king was discovered. Hence the last two acts appear largely superfluous, brought in for the sake of individual scenes. Psychological struggles are not neglected. The king is caught between his duty to the state and his love of the countess. Whether he had the power to marry a woman who was not of royal blood is not explained, nor is it made clear why he should believe that the countess wished to kill him and thus lose her only chance for power. The immorality and brutality of La Calprenède's Edward are historical enough. His rôle of melancholy lover comes from Bandello's narrative. The countess has to defend her virtue against the king, supported, to a certain extent, by her father. She is in love neither with Edward nor with her husband's memory. The character, though brave, is cold. One wonders whether, after all, her conduct is not calculated as the best means of reaching the throne. An interesting character is that of her father, the Earl of Warwick, who has to choose between his family honor and his loyalty to the monarch. His shame at the king's proposition is well depicted. It is after he has promised to aid the king that he learns the service to be rendered is the betrayal of his daughter. When he finds that she is ashamed of him for bringing the king's proposition, he is as delighted as Don Diègue was on discovering his son's *agréable colère*. Despite this interesting figure, however, the play is distinctly inferior to the author's English tragedies in its characters as well as in its plot and the value of individual scenes.

III. HIS LAST PLAYS

In *Essex* the dramatic talent of La Calprenède reached its climax. After *Edouard* he seems to cast about for a subject, continuing another author's production, returning to the non-historical play, writing a tragedy in prose. When none of these efforts brought to his work the genuine renovation that he sought, he turned to the novel. It is his last efforts at dramatic expression that I would now discuss.

The most popular tragedy playing toward 1639 was Tristan's *Mariane*, for the *Cid* was still considered a tragi-comedy. Attempts had been made to continue the latter play. La Calprenède now sought with his *Mort des enfans d'Herodes ou suite de Mariane* to

perform a similar service for the former, finding his material in the same source that Tristan[1] had used, Josephus.[2] The account there given of Herod's judicial murder of his two sons is followed with some omissions and additions. The distribution of the dramatic material and the characterization of Herod are under the influence of Tristan, but the interest is less concentrated than in his model, not only because there are two victims instead of the single and more arresting character of Mariane, but because certain unnecessary details are introduced from the Jewish narrative.

The first act is largely superfluous, as it brings in three elements from Josephus that have no effect upon the play's progress: Alexander's fear that his wife, Glaphira, may be the object of his father's passion, Herod's remorse over the execution of Mariane, and the banishment of Pherore. The real action begins with the second act, in which Herod's other legitimate son, Aristobulus, angers his half-brother, Antipater, by referring contemptuously to his illegitimate birth. The latter, already seeking to undo his brothers, pretends by means of forged letters that the princes are planning Herod's arrest. These fraudulent documents and Salome's suggestions cause Herod to throw his sons into prison, despite the efforts of Glaphira and an ambassador from her father's court. False evidence is obtained against them. Their trial is conducted by Herod with marked injustice, although, contrary to Josephus, they are allowed to defend themselves, and Glaphira is introduced as a witness. In the fifth act the brothers appear in prison, Alexander fearing Herod's designs on his wife, Aristobulus hoping for mercy till they are ordered out to be executed, whereupon Alexander prays that Herod be forgiven and Glaphira protected, while Aristobulus expresses his readiness to *saouler ce monstre et reioindre la Reyne.* A last touch of cruelty is given to Herod when he promises Glaphira to spare his sons, knowing they are already dead.[3] The last scene shows her in the prison beside the dead bodies of the princes.

[1] The association between the two plays is so close that the frontispiece to Tristan's *Mariane* (Paris: Courbé, 1637) was used for La Calprenède's play in 1639. See Jacques Madeleine, *Tristan, La Mariane* (Paris: Hachette, 1917), p. xxix.

[2] *Antiquities*, XVI, chaps. ii, iv, vii–xi, and *Jewish Wars*, I, chaps. xxiii, xxiv, xxvii, xxviii.

[3] It is in a similar vein that Racine makes Nero accept his mother's demand for his reconciliation with Britannicus.

Most of the incidents are found, as I have said, in Josephus. Glaphira's appeal to Salome is substituted for that of Aristobulus. The testimony of Eurycles, Tero, Trypho, and the eunuchs is omitted as involving needless repetition. Alterations in the trial have been indicated. The last act is uninfluenced by Josephus, who merely states that the young men were strangled in prison. A comparison with *Mariane* shows a structural similarity between the plays. In each the first act introduces Herod and Salome, the second shows the victim angering, by haughtiness, an unscrupulous enemy, the formation of a conspiracy, the making of an accusation, and an arrest. The trial follows in the third act of *Mariane*, but it is delayed till the fourth act of the later play. In both trials the defendant is defiant, the decision held in doubt by a momentary display of compassion on the part of Herod. Then, in each case, a prison scene is added, the victims are led out to their execution, and the play ends in a monologue expressing sorrow.

The characterization of Herod is also influenced by Tristan, but the result is less successful. This rôle had been played by Mondory, and, indeed, the new tragedy may have been written chiefly to show Herod again to an admiring public. In Tristan's work the cruel and jealous king, driven by his love to kill the person he most desires to save, is a highly dramatic figure. But in La Calprenède's play his paternal feeling is not made sufficiently evident for us to be sure there is a struggle in his breast. He appears more purely the melodramatic monster. Moreover, we are not sure whether or not he desires to take his son's wife for himself, whether or not he feels remorse over the execution of the princes.[1]

We miss, too, the proud figure of Mariane. The interest in the victim is divided between the two sons, who would have been more truly tragic if less effort had been made to correct their arrogance and who lack the force to make any other effort to save themselves than a feeble preparation for escape, which results only in their being more deeply compromised. Glaphira is a purely pathetic figure, displaying none of the pride of birth with which Josephus credits her. Had the suggestion that Herod was in love with her been developed, she might have become a dramatic figure. As it is, she bears some

[1] As in Josephus, Herod dyes his hair, a strange detail to find in a classical tragedy.

resemblance to the Bérénice of La Calprenède's first play and, like her, is not essential to the action. Hence one is surprised to find her playing so important a rôle at the end of the tragedy. D'Aubignac[1] contrasts her final monologue with the concluding speech of Herod in *Mariane* and of Elizabeth in the *Comte d'Essex*. The audience wishes to see how Herod and Elizabeth are affected by the death of their victims, whom they still love, but it is little interested in Glaphira, who has only the usual commonplaces of an afflicted widow to express. While Herod's monologue and Elizabeth's are needed to complete the play in which they occur, Glaphira's is superfluous.

Phalante need not detain us. It is non-historical, as far as I have been able to determine, like Du Ryer's *Alcionée*. It is *précieux* both in subject-matter and in treatment, a subject for comedy, entitled tragedy because of the intensity of the sentiments expressed and the death of all the important persons in the play. Hélène, queen of Corinth, is loved by her subject, Philoxène, and a princely refugee, Phalante, whom she loves in return. The plot depends entirely upon the fact that Philoxène has asked Phalante to urge his suit for him. Without this request there would be no play. As it is, Phalante is divided between love of the queen and fidelity to his friend; Hélène, between love and modesty. "En fin, Phalante, I'ayme, ô Dieu! ce mot me tuë."[2] And so, if not the word, the thing does kill her, for, after a duel between the rivals, one of whom throws himself upon the other's unwilling sword, and the departure of Phalante to the wilds to mourn his friend, she can find no better solution of her problems than to take poison. Phalante comes back for a last interview with her, then stabs himself.

Of far greater interest is *Hermenigilde*, an experimental play both in its prose form and in the fact that it treats of a martyrdom. Puget de la Serre had already written a number of prose tragedies. La Calprenède, either because the novelty of the form interested him, or because, busy with the composition of his first romance, he now had little time to write verse, imitated him, as did d'Aubignac, Scudéry, and Du Ryer. His experiment seems to have failed, for

[1] *Pratique du Théâtre* (1715) I, 126, 302.

[2] Acte I, sc. 2.

Pousset de Montauban found it necessary in 1654 to turn *Hermenigilde* into verse.[1]

Lives of the saints, while still forming a subject for the drama in medieval survivals and in school plays, had been excluded from the popular stage. In the forties quite a number of such subjects were dramatized. Du Ryer had called attention by his *Saül* to the possibilities of a play which used religion as an important motive. Baro may have written his *St. Eustache* as early as 1639.[2] Puget de la Serre published in 1642 his *Thomas Morus;* in 1643 his *Ste. Catherine;* Desfontaines, in 1643, his *St. Eustache*, his *St. Alexis* and *St. Genest* in 1645. The chefs d'œuvre of the school are undoubtedly Rotrou's *St. Genest* and Corneille's *Polyeucte.* In the present state of knowledge it is hard to make out the chronological order of these pieces. Plays were usually represented from one to three years before they were published, but it often happened that one play, written before another, was printed after it. Hence we cannot tell just what the importance of *Hermenigilde* is. It was published the same year as *Polyeucte*, but until we know just when both plays were represented no definite statement can be made as to which influenced the other.

The ultimate source of the play lies in historical events described by Gregory of Tours.[3] The Visigothic king, Leuvigildus, was an Arrian, like his second wife, Goisunta, and his sons by his first marriage, Hermenegildus and Richaredus. Ingundis, daughter of the Frankish king and like her father, a Catholic, married Hermenegildus, but remained firm in her faith despite first the blandishments and then the tortures of her husband's stepmother, who threw her on the ground, trampled upon her, and had her plunged into a pond. When she went with her husband to rule a Spanish province, she converted him to Catholicism. Hearing of his father's anger at this event, Hermenegildus turned to the Greek emporer for aid and revolted against the king. Besieged, he was visited by his brother

[1] *Indégonde* (Paris: de Luine).

[2] In his Preface, published in 1649, he states that he has withheld publication for ten years and now brings out the play to distinguish it from a piece by Desfontaines that has the same name. But as the latter play was published in 1643, Baro may be merely seeking to prove his play older than the other.

[3] Cf. René Poupardin, *Grégoire de Tours* (Paris: Picard, 1913) especially Book V, chap. xxviii, pp. 191, 192.

and promised safety if he would surrender, but when he had given himself up, he was exiled and finally put to death.

The sixth-century Spanish chronicler, Johannes Biclarensis, tells the story in much the same way,[1] but he omits the name of the prince's wife and says nothing of the persecution to which she was subjected by her husband's stepmother. He adds the fact that Seville was the city in which Hermenegildus was besieged. In neither account is the prince represented as a martyr, though Gregory states that his conversion caused his father's hostility. Gregory the Great, in his *Dialogi* (iii), described the death of the prince and added miraculous details, but he failed to mention the revolt, the efforts of Goisunta, and the parley between the brothers. Subsequent accounts were based chiefly on these sources. Some of them, Juan Vaseo,[2] Paulus Diaconus,[3] and the *Primera Crónica general*[4] omit the relations between the two princesses. Baronius[5] quotes Gregory of Tours at great length, adding information derived from Gregory the Great. He does not give the name of the city where Hermenegildus was besieged, but his reference to the Bishop of Seville, who, according to Gregory the Great, converted the prince, may have suggested that Seville was the city in question. Mariana[6] gives a still more complete account in which all the details I have mentioned are repeated, the scene is laid in Seville, the martyrdom is emphasized, and the various speeches are highly elaborated.

The ultimate source of La Calprenède was, as I have said, Gregory of Tours. His account of the relations existing between the two princesses is too closely followed to allow of any other interpretation. But Gregory's text is not enough to explain the location in Seville and the emphasis placed upon the martyrdom. I would therefore conclude that he derived the plot from an intermediate source, Baronius, Mariana, or some other historian who combined Gregory's account with details that are lacking there.[7]

[1] *España sagrada* (Madrid: Antonio Marin, 1751), VI, 375, 381–85. Isidore of Seville, who devotes only eight words to the whole affair, is negligible as a source.

[2] *Rerum Hispanicarum Scriptores* (Francofurti: Wechelius, 1579), pp. 552–56.

[3] *Historia Langobardorum*, Book III, chap. xxi.

[4] Edited by Menéndez Pidal (Madrid, 1906), pp. 260, 262.

[5] *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Lucae: Venturinus, 1741), X, 386, 387, 395, 396.

[6] *Historia de España*, Book V, chap. xii. The Latin text, rather than the Spanish, was probably used by La Calprenède.

[7] A friend has kindly suggested to me the probability of a Spanish play having been the source of *Hermenigilde*. He argues that as plays dealing with saints were rare

When the play begins, the hero is besieged in Seville, a situation similar to the opening scenes of *la Mort de Mithridate* and *Ieanne d'Angleterre*. When his brother comes to offer him pardon, he yields in order to avoid bloodshed, although he foresees his own destruction. The king now debates as to what shall be done with him. His daughter and second son beg him to keep his word, but his wife urges him to condemn Hermenegildus as a traitor. The arguments are repeated by subordinate characters. Hermenegildus, in the third act, spurns the suggestion made by his brother and sister that he give up his religion in order to win his pardon; in the fourth, brought before his father, he defends himself at great length, but again refuses to return to Arianism.[1] His stepmother argues, as does the king in Mariana's account, that his profession of Catholicism is only a pretext for seeking to win the throne. Again pleas are made for and against the execution, and the king agrees to spare him if he will renounce his faith. The last act passes in prison. Ingundis, like Polyeucte, puts love above self-interest, religion above either: "I'ayme Hermenigilde beaucoup plus que moy-mesme; mais i'ayme mieux qu'il n'y ait plus d'Hermenigilde au monde pour moy, que

---

in France but common in Spain and as a Spanish saint is here in question Spanish influence is "probable on a priori grounds." He then calls attention to three Spanish plays mentioned by La Barrera, *la tragedia de San Hermenegildo, rey y mártir* (p. 580), *el Mártir y Rey de Sevilla, San Hermenegildo ó el Rey mas perfecto* (p. 508), and *El primer blason de España, San Hermenegildo* (p. 187), and argues from the fact of their existence that La Calprenède's tragedy "may well have derived from some Spanish play existing or lost." These suggestions are certainly worthy of careful study, but various considerations prevent my accepting these conclusions. (1) The fact that a French author wrote about a foreign saint does not make it necessary to assume that he drew his information from a work by a compatriot of the saint. One would not suggest, for instance, that Puget de la Serre based his *Thomas Morus* on an English play. (2) The influence of the *comedia* was large in France, but various dramatists, Hardy, Du Ryer, Tristan, and others, escaped it. (3) I find no evidence of Spanish influence on La Calprenède's other plays. (4) *Hermenigilde* shows none of the supernatural elements commonly found in the *comedia de santos*. Neither is the hero a king, as he is in at least two of the Spanish plays, nor does the play show any influence of Spanish technique. (5) La Calprenède could hardly have seen any of the three Spanish plays mentioned. According to La Barrera, the last two are not earlier than the second half of the seventeenth century. Of the first it is known only that it was acted in a school at some time during the century. It is an extremely obscure production and was probably never published nor acted by professionals. In order therefore to conclude that La Calprenède made use of a Spanish play, one must assume that in the first half of the seventeenth century there existed a *comedia* so well known that it passed into France and attracted the attention of this French dramatist, but that it subsequently became so completely forgotten that not even its name is known today. Such an occurrence is certainly far less probable that that La Calprenède turned to a Latin author such as Baronius or Mariana. Personally, I cannot accept a contrary hypothesis, but I leave the reader to judge for himself.

[1] In re-working the play, Montauban adds four judges, thus representing more completely the formal trial; cf. *op. cit.*, Act III, scenes 1–3.

s'il me restoit un Hermenigilde apostat." The hero again refuses to give up his religion and is led away to execution. Ingundis has a vision of his death, hears an account of it from an attendant, and dies.

The first two acts follow the historical narrative closely enough, but Ingundis, who was really left with the Greeks, is brought into the action. A sister and Gothic noblemen are added. The second, third, and fourth acts could easily be combined into one, for there are frequent repetitions of argument. Resemblances to various plays of the time occur. The king, who promises pardon to a rebel, then breaks his word when the latter has surrendered, recalls Du Ryer's *Alcionée*. The hostile stepmother appears again in Rotrou's *Cosroès* and Corneille's *Nicomède*. As in *Polyeucte*, the subject is the martyrdom of a prince; the king hesitates like Félix, gives his son a last chance to recant; there is a conflict between religion and ties of close relationship. Finally, the play is much like *la Mort des enfans d'Hérodes*, for a father puts his son to death, there is a trial in the fourth act, the sentence is not immediately executed, the fifth act passes in prison, where the victim's wife plays an important rôle. The play possesses a good deal of pathos and a variety of characters, but it lacks action and approaches closely La Calprenède's ideal tragedy, a trial, followed by an execution. Indeed, La Calprenède appears to have had little more to say in dramatic form. Instead of further repetition, he turned to the novel.

Toward the end of his life, however, he came back, like Corneille, to the drama, writing *Bellissaire* for the Hôtel de Bourgogne and undertaking for Molière a play of unknown subject. For the former work he chose a theme that had already been dramatized by Rotrou and Desfontaines. It was never published, though it probably remained in the repertory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne for a score of years.[1] Its first appearance there is noted in the following lines from Loret's journal[2] of July 12, 1659:

> Pour voir, en Tragi-Comédie,
> Une Piéce grave et hardie,

[1] It certainly did so if I am correct in concluding that this is the play alluded to on folio 83 verso of the *Mémoire de Mahelot et de Laurent*, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS 24330, fonds français.

[2] *La Muze historique* (ed. Livet; Paris: Daffis, 1878), III, 78.

Dont le sujet soit signalé,
Extrémement bien démêlé,
Et digne de ravir et plaire,
Il faut voir le Grand *Bellissaire*
Que les sieurs Acteurs de l'Hôtel
Tiennent d'un Auteur immortel,
Sçavoir le fameux Calprenéde,
Piéce, sans mentir, qui ne céde
Aux Ouvrages les plus parfaits
Que depuis dix ans on ait faits,
Piéce, entre les plus mémorables,
Qui contient des Vers admirables,
Piéce valant mille écus d'or,
Et dans laquelle Floridor,
Qui de grace et d'esprit abonde
A le plus beau rolle du Monde.

IV. A GENERAL CRITICISM

La Calprenède's contribution to seventeenth-century drama lies in the fact that, in the first place, he aided the development of the classical system; in the second, he represented more than anyone else certain interesting, but ephemeral tendencies. His work belongs chiefly to the seven or eight years preceding *Polyeucte*, when the classical formulas were being worked out. He was one of Corneille's numerous rivals in playwriting, but as he began to produce later than most of these he often appears less original than they. At first he felt his way, beginning with a tragedy that showed considerable talent and with two tragi-comedies. Coming apparently under the influence of Tristan, courtier and adventurer like himself, he was brought back to historical tragedy and, whether by contact with Englishmen at court or by the study of Montchrestien's *Ecossaise*, he, first of his generation, turned to the modern field. In *Ieanne d'Angleterre* he first expressed his peculiar notion of a tragedy. In *Essex* he produced his chef d'œuvre. He continued to experiment but not to improve, and finally turned to the novel, where he met with his chief success.

Classical concentration is obvious in most of his plays. Except in the two early tragi-comedies, where unity of time is slightly violated, all the plays observe the twenty-four-hour rule. The

place in these tragi-comedies and in *Phalante* includes a city and a forest at some distance from it. In his first tragedy and his last, places within a town and immediately outside it are represented. Elsewhere the unity is that of a few houses in a city. The chief violations of the unity of action are also in the early tragi-comedies, where a *deus ex machinâ* appears. In the other plays violations are slight, consisting chiefly of repetitions or unnecessary amplifications, for now and then he plans his play in such a manner that without resorting to like devices he would not have enough material to fill five acts.

In the development of the psychological struggle also La Calprenède plays a part. Nowhere does he go so far as Corneille did in the *Cid*, but there is in each play a struggle, which often fills the most important scenes. The rôle of Elizabeth is especially noteworthy in this respect. It is doubtful, however, whether La Calprenède realized the full significance of a character like hers, for he usually emphasizes the pathetic victim rather than the person who has the power to choose—Mithridates rather than his son; Lady Jane rather than Mary; Herod's sons rather than Herod himself; Hermenigildus rather than his father. But in any case it is the mental states of the persons that interest him, instead of the duels, battles, recognitions, and disguises that might have been expected from the author whose novels are largely remembered for the redoubtable sword thrusts described by Madame de Sévigné.[1] However strange it may seem, the only examples of dueling are in *Bradamante* and *Phalante*. The executions which conclude four of his tragedies are not represented on the stage. Nothing like the spectacular scene at the end of his *Mithridate* is found in his later tragedies. He also joins Corneille, Rotrou, and Tristan in the emphasis he places on blood kinship or other close relationship as a means of heightening tragic effect. A father is betrayed by his son. Sons are put to death by their fathers. A queen condemns her lover.

The characters are aristocratic. In every play there is a king or queen. Conspiracy, real or imaginary, against the government and the punishment of it are the principal themes. Usually the victim

[1] *Lettres* ("Grands Ecrivains" ed.; Paris: Hachette, 1862), II, 270.

is partly to blame for his fate. This is clearly true of Essex. Even Hermenigildus, whatever be his motives, has conspired against his father and called in foreign aid. Though La Calprenède was far less than Corneille a dramatizer of the will, certain of his characters would not be out of place among the latter's uncompromising heroes: Mithridates and Bérénice, who die rather than yield to the Romans; Elizabeth, who sacrifices her lover to reasons of state; Elips, who prefers suicide to dishonor; Hermenigildus, for whom religion has the same importance it has for Polyeucte.

In these and other respects La Calprenède reinforces the classical tradition. He shows his individuality in the emphasis he places on the modern or late medieval subject and the formal trial. For the sources of his first three plays he went to well-known authors, Plutarch, Ariosto, and, perhaps, the late Greek novelists. Then, discovering the value of recent English history, he wrote *Ieanne d'Angleterre*, *Essex*, and *Edouard*. In sixteenth-century tragedy a few examples of the modern subject can be found,[1] but Hardy left no record of similar usage except that certain of his tragi-comedies contain plots from modern fiction. Mairet dramatized a modern subject in his *Soliman*, represented in 1635 or 1636, but even in Racine's day the Turkish theme was not considered a violation of the rule for *éloignement*. If, then, we may judge by dates of publication, *Ieanne d'Angleterre* is the first play of the period based on an event in modern history. It was followed by several pieces that have to do with incidents of the fifteenth or sixteenth century,[2] but La Calprenède failed to exert any permanent influence in this direction. It was not till the eighteenth century that writers of tragedy turned to any extent to this field. During the Romantic period Stendhal[3] demanded subjects from Gregory of Tours, Froissart, Livy, the Bible, and modern Greek history—a program that, unknown to him, had been almost carried out by La Calprenède in the midst of the classical period.

[1] *Philanire, femme d'Hypolite* and *l'Ecossaise*, for example.

[2] Regnier, *Marie Stuard*, (1639); d' Aubignac, *la Pucelle d'Orléans* (1642); Puget de la serre, *Thomas Morus* (1642); Mareschal, *Charles le Hardy* (1646).

[3] Cited by M. Doumic in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, VII, 364.

The second mark of individuality is the development of the formal trial as a dramatic device. There was nothing novel in this idea, for it was already known to the Greeks. Aeschylus in the *Eumenides*[1] and Aristophanes in the *Wasps*[2] had represented judges, defendants, and prosecutors. Hardy had used the formal trial in a number of cases.[3] The most interesting of these are the trials of Coriolanus and of Gesippe by the Roman senate. In other cases there is a single judge, as later in *Hermenigilde*. Hardy probably had no theory with regard to the trial, but he found examples of it in the themes from ancient history that he treated and saw in them the dramatic values of conflict and suspense. As the early plays of the generation that followed Hardy's were little concerned with ancient subjects, the more democratic judges were usually replaced by the ruler, as in Du Ryer's *Aretaphile*, but when ancient themes came back into vogue the judges reappear, as in Tristan's *Mariane*.

In none of these plays, however, was the trial highly developed. La Calprenède, after showing a marked interest in decisions reached after argument or combat, represented a formal trial with considerable detail in his *Ieanne d'Angleterre*, and at still greater length in *Essex*. Trials occur again in *Edouard, la Mort des enfans d'Herodes*, and, to a certain extent, in *Hermenigilde*. According to this system, the ideal tragedy shows an arrest toward the end of the first act, followed by scenes of preparation for a trial that takes place in the third or fourth act. The victim appears in the opening scenes of the fifth act and is led away to be executed behind the scenes. The news is brought to someone deeply interested in the event and comment of some sort ends the play. In *Ieanne* the chancellor announces that the trial will be before the barons. The accused raises legal points and his judges answer them. In *Essex* the whole of the third act is devoted to the trial. Again the court is composed of English lords and the accused brings charges against them. Evidence for the prosecution is brought forward and an attempt is made to diminish its importance. Finally the presiding official sentences the accused. In *Edouard* the king presides and the judges reach no

[1] 566 ff. [2] 891 ff.

[3] *Scedase*, Act V; *Achille*, Act II, scene 3; *Coriolan*, I, 2; V, 2; *Mariamne*, IV, 2; *Gesippe*, V, 1; *Ravissement de Proserpine*, V, last scene; *Timoclée*, V, last scene.

decision. In *la Mort des enfans d'Herodes* Herod both presides and prosecutes. His sons speak in their defense and Glaphira is called in to testify. Finally in *Hermenigilde* the hero defends himself at length before his father, who offers him the opportunity to give up his religion and, when he refuses, condemns him to death.

It is worthy of note that the dramatist who paid most attention to the formal trial was not himself a lawyer, as were his contemporaries, Corneille, Du Ryer, Rotrou, Auvray, Rayssiguier. Perhaps the drama of the law appealed to him with greater force on this account. But it is doubtful whether it appealed so much to his audience. D'Aubignac finds that it has ceased to interest the public of the fifties. He explains this fact as follows:[1]

> Personne n'a presque jamais approuvé les Conseils & les Jugemens de Criminels, que nous y voyons neanmoins assez frequemment, parce que c'est une simple Déliberation: & bien que l'Accusé, qui d'ordinaire est le Heros de la Piéce, agisse par interêt & avec effort, nous voyons neanmoins que le Théâtre languit, si-tôt qu' il est question de juger: La raison est que ceux qui restent, quand ce personnage s'est éloigné, sont ordinairement de mauvais Acteurs, tous assis, & partant sans action; recitant deux ou trois mauvais vers, & qu' on ne peut faire gueres meilleurs en cette rencontre: & des gens encore qui sans interêt suivent par lâcheté les volontez d'un Tyran.

In the novel La Calprenède's talent found freer expression. The emphasis that he there places upon incident recalls his tragi-comedies rather than his more serious plays. Such physical combats as he had already depicted in his early tragi-comedies and *Phalante* can be matched by numerous passages in his novels. But the predominating psychological interest of his tragedies is echoed also in the story of *Cleone*,[2] which has been called a forerunner of the *Princesse de Clèves*.[3] Evidence of hasty composition, lack of variety in his incidents, and concentration in place and time, which I have pointed out in discussing his plays, reappear in his novels. But in writing these he could concern himself less than in his plays with the motives that lay behind his incidents or the order in which his events were arranged. Much was said a generation ago about the repressive

[1] *Op. cit.*, II, 287.

[2] *Cassandre*, Part IV, Book II, chap. vi.

[3] Cf. Lefranc, *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, XIV, 583.

effect of classical regulation upon Corneille, but, as a matter of fact, the rules rather sustained him in his effort to substitute the study of states of mind for something of less importance. La Calprenède tried to do the same thing, and several of his plays show how nearly he came to succeeding, but, lacking both seriousness of purpose, thanks to the aristocratic disdain he felt toward his profession, and versatility of imagination, he was able neither to extract from his subjects all that was in them nor to vary his treatment nor to give his characters effective expression. Hence the difference between his relative rank among the dramatists and among the novelists of his day. If we divide the former into classes he would not be put higher than the third, for he is inferior not only to Corneille but to Mairet, Rotrou, Du Ryer, and Tristan. As a novelist, on the other hand, he was placed by his contemporaries with Mlle de Scudéry at the head of the list.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

CORNEILLE'S EARLY FRIENDS AND SURROUNDINGS

The literature of the seventeenth century is, in general, of little value for revelations of a personal nature about the authors of the time, since it favors the abstract, the general, the typical rather than the particular. The "honnestes gens"—and what seventeenth century French author did not aspire to be classified among them?—inclined to be reticent about their private life. They considered it bad form to display too much of their intimate existence to the indiscreet gaze of the crowd. A significant illustration of this state of mind is that Pascal condemned Montaigne for his unrestrained indulgence in self-revelation. Imbued with the conceptions of his day, Corneille possessed to a high degree this aristocratic reserve about his personal feelings and adventures. With the exception of a few scattered lines, for instance, in his *Excuse à Ariste*, he hardly ever referred directly to his "ego." To reconstruct his surroundings, to gather facts about his life, we have had to rely chiefly upon the doubtful anecdotes of the *Ana*, echoes of the gossip of the day; recently the valuable researches of Taschereau, Gosselin, Bouquet; and more recently still those of G. Dubosc, C. Searles and W. A. Nitze have revealed new aspects of Corneille or unknown Cornelian documents, and have disposed of some picturesque legends and unwarranted assertions.

Yet Corneille's formative years, when he was a student, a youthful lawyer, and a pleasure-loving rhymer at Rouen, have remained comparatively dim and unexplained. He has been depicted, at his début, as a young man without poetical training, isolated in his province, as one who, incited solely by the magic spur of love, produced his early poems and plays. The critics credited him with but slight literary culture and persuaded themselves that his inborn genius was sufficient to foster his talent in spite of his isolation and his supposedly unfavorable surroundings.

Sainte-Beuve, in contradiction here with his general views, conceived Corneille's genius as a kind of spontaneous blossoming,

altogether independent of his surroundings, and he may be taken as representative. He declared that Corneille's was "a genius by instinct, personal and free of movement."[1] Nisard wrote: "No writer has merited more than Corneille the title of creative genius. He is unique in the history of literature by the prodigious distance which separates him from those who immediately preceded him. . . . . An abyss separates Corneille from all that can be called dramatic production before him. . . . . Descartes created the method and only purified the language. Corneille created both the language and the method."[2]

But is it not more logical to claim for Corneille no exceptional evolution, to conceive the flowering of his talent as due, at least in part, to the intellectual atmosphere of his native city, to the books he read, to the friends he made, and to the plays he saw represented there? Genius, although not entirely dependent upon its environment, is modeled by it and developed in certain directions; it uses the humbler material of its daily life in the building of masterpieces. Has Corneille been a fortuitous exception to this rule?

The root of the conception of his genius as "free and independent," as blossoming forth without preparation, lies in a too literal interpretation of Fontennelle's anecdote, which no modern historian accepts at its face value: Pierre Corneille was suddenly transformed into a playwright by his love for a Rouen girl, the Mélite of his first work. We cannot doubt that his amorous feelings were the occasion for the first important expression of his talent—Corneille said, "Love taught me to rime"—but it is certainly not its origin. Without a certain mastery of verse-technique and of vocabulary, and, in a measure, of stagecraft, all of which presuppose an adequate knowledge of contemporary French literature, he could not have written even such a work as *Mélite*. Corneille was thrown upon his own resources in acquiring mastery of his mother-tongue, for the Jesuits of the time, in whose school at Rouen he was educated, employed only Latin and ignored the vernacular.[3]

[1] *Portraits littéraires*, I: *P. Corneille.*

[2] *Histoire de la Litterature francaise*, II, 87–88.

[3] Cf. "Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Jesu," in G. Compayré's *Histoire critique des doctrines de l'éducation en France*, I (1879), 167.

In the past the critics have conceived Paris as the only outstanding literary milieu in the France of the time: this it became only decades later; Rouen has been regarded as a provincial town where literature received but scant attention. A more attentive study of Corneille's early surroundings reveals the fact that, in the first decades of the seventeenth century, Rouen was as favorable a literary milieu as was the capital. Corneille found there in abundance all that could give impulse to his early poetic endeavors and guide them toward the fervid art of his masterpieces: books and friends who incited his talent with the sympathy of common interests. His early work reveals serious preparation in language, verse-technique, and, relatively speaking, in stagecraft. He was well acquainted with the literary fashions of the day, and even so early a work as *Mélite* shows unmistakable traces of the literature of the time.[1] His early achievements are due less to a sudden flare of genius, kindled by love, than to his environment, which happily nurtured his poetical gifts. This literary and linguistic training he must have acquired by his own efforts and at Rouen, for there is no evidence and little likelihood that he ever visited Paris before 1630 or the beginning of 1631, when *Mélite* was played there.

The present article proposes to give some information about Corneille's early friends who created the literary atmosphere in which his talent unfolded, and to point out some facts about his surroundings which must have stimulated his early literary endeavors.

His first interest in the theater may have been awakened in the young Corneille by the plays which were probably performed in the "Jeu de Paume" which bordered the courtyard of his father's house in the Rue de la Pie.[2] It is known that in later years troupes of actors made use of this inclosure for dramatic representations, and, since it is generally accepted that the companies of Valleran and

[1] Cf. my article in *Modern Philology*, XVII, 141: "A Commonplace in Corneille's *Mélite*."

[2] *Registres du Tabellionage de Rouen.* The property of the Corneilles was composed of "plusieurs corps et tenements de maisons ... bornés, d'un bout, par devant, le pavé du roy, en la rue de la Pie, et d'autre bout, par derrière, le jeu de paume de St. Eustache." Cf. Ballin "Extraits d'actes de vente relatifs aux maisons de Pierre et de Thomas Corneille," *Revue de Rouen* (1863), p. 241; and G. Dubosc, *Trois Normands*, pp. 43–44.

Lenoir-Mondory visited Rouen before 1630, it is at least possible that the young Corneille was drawn to the stage by the impressions gathered in the popular theater of his own neighborhood.

There is no evidence that before 1630 Rouen possessed any important literary circles, any "salons" after the fashion of the famous contemporary Parisian drawing-rooms, but the interest in literature was very lively and general. To be convinced of this one has only to examine the accounts of the annual poetic contests, the "Puys de l'Immaculée Conception," which mention a great number of the poets of Rouen, authors of weak and edifying verse in honor of the Virgin. Besides this, some of the fellow-citizens of the young Corneille had theatrical ambitions. In this respect Rouen may be said to represent the general state of Normandy in the early decades of the seventeenth century, when this province took the leadership of France in literary production. Bertaut, Malherbe, Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, Pradon, Benserade, des Yvetaux, Boisrobert, d'Ouville, St.-Amand, de Marbeuf, Huet, de Scudéry, Montchrestien, Brébeuf, were all Normans, as were also some lesser lights, as the two J. Auvrays, J. Behourt, P. Brinon, David Ferrand, du Hamel, Courval-Sonnet, J. Hays, de Méliglosse, Nicolas de Montreux, P. Troterel, and others. At the same time Rouen was an important printing center where all the valuable works of the period were published or republished. This means that Corneille in his early years had a great abundance of reading matter within his reach: plays, novels, popular pamphlets, manuals of gallantry, etc. He himself has left a few indications as to the authors he had read before or about the time of *Mélite*, but he mentions only "feu Hardy et quelques modernes," and Ronsard, Malherbe, and Théophile.[1] There is, besides, a reference to the Chevalier Marin, in the *Gallerie du Palais*. It is, however, hazardous to conclude from this, as does Sainte-Beuve, that "Ronsard, Malherbe, Théophile et Hardy composaient donc à peu près toute sa littérature moderne" (*op. cit.*, I, 34). It is unlikely that Corneille neglected the nearly complete library of the literature of his time printed in Rouen by Raphael and David du Petit-Val, Abraham Cousturier, Jean Petit, Théodore Reinsart, Jean Osmont, and others. From about 1624 to about 1629, generally considered

[1] *Examen de Mélite*, 1660; *Au Lecteur, Mélite*, 1633.

the formative period of his talent, he must have visited the law courts, although he probably never tried a case. In the galleries of this building were the booksellers' stalls and hardly any new publication shown there could have escaped his attention, the more so since David du Petit-Val, the most important Rouen publisher of plays and verse, was his friend and composed a sonnet in his praise. This sonnet is found among the laudatory poems in the first edition of *La Veuve:*

> Saint Amant, ne crains plus d'avouer ta patrie,
> Puisque ce Dieu des vers est né dans la Neustrie,
> Qui pour se rendre illustre à la postérité,
>
> Accomplit en nos jours l'incroyable merveille
> De cet oiseau fameux parmi l'antiquité,
> Nous donnant un Phénix sous le nom de Corneille.[1]

Both Raphael and David du Petit-Val devoted much attention to the printing of plays: they became, with Abel Langelier and Toussainct de Bray of Paris, the leading publishers of plays in the early seventeenth century. From their presses came "receuils" of tragedies, besides works by Larivey, Robert Garnier, Jacques Grévin, Jean de la Péruse, Le Jars, and others. They published nearly all the works of P. Troterel, sieur d'Aves, some of those of Hardy, and a number of pastoral plays. They also took a leading part in the publication of verse. Besides the volumes of du Bellay, Philippe Desportes, and others, they printed important "receuils" of poems of the best-known authors of the time. In the first edition of the fourth volume of his *Théatre,* Hardy praised their care and accuracy, and expressed his discontent at the negligence of his former Parisian publisher, Jacques Quesnel: "Je donne un droit de primogéniture contre l'ordre à ce dernier volume ... veu que les précédents me font rougir de la honte des Imprimeurs, ausquels l'avarice fist trahir ma réputation, estans si pleins de fautes, tant à

[1] Marty-Laveaux, I, 386. Du Petit-Val, no doubt, refers to the following verses of Saint-Amant:

> Cher compatriote de Lâtre,
> Humeur que mon âme idolatre,
> Homme à tout faire, esprit charmant,
> Pour qui j'avoue estre Normant (*La Vigne*, 1627).

This de Lâtre, or de Lastre, who published some poems in the *Cabinet des Muses* of 1619 and was crowned several times at the Palinods, was the maternal grandfather of Pradon.

l'orthographe qu'aus vers que je voudrois en pouvoir effacer jusques à la mémoire. Au regard du dernier, un imprimeur digne de sa profession te le rend, Amy Lecteur ... aussi correct que le peut souffrir la presse. ... Car jaçoit que Paris excelle en nombre d'Iimprimeurs qui ne le cèdent à aucuns de l'Europe; cela n'empesche que beaucoup de passevolants se rencontrent parmy leurs vieilles bandes. Et de ma part j'aime mieux que mon livre ... soit bien imprimé à Rouen que mal à Paris."[1]

Besides these two excellent publishers—the two du Petit-Vals—A. Cousturier, Jean Petit, Jean Osmont, Claude Le Villain, and others, published the younger writers and new editions of the older masters. They follow in curious contrast: Remy Belleau and Théophile at the same time as the tragedies of Jean Behourt; the tragedies and pastoral plays of Nicolas Chrestien, sieur des Croix, together with the translations of Buchanan's tragedies by Pierre de Brinon, Montchrestien's works, the *Iris* of Coignée de Bourron, the theater of Hardy, and the *Guerrier Repenty* of Jacques Le Clerq. Garnier's works number twenty-one editions at Rouen from 1596 to 1618. Works of Mairet are printed by the side of those of Denis Coppée, "bourgeois de Huy," and of A. Gautier, "Apotiquaire Avranchois."

The Rouen publications from 1600–1630 show a motley confusion of styles and literary tendencies: it was a groping period, preparing the classical age. Pastoral plays, tragedies, tragi-comedies, were printed there in greater numbers than anywhere else in France at that time. Abraham Cousturier published a whole series of plays, popular in tone, reminding one of the morality plays, without names of authors or dates. They probably constituted the current repertory of the wandering comedians who periodically visited Rouen.[2]

[1] *Œuvres de Hardy*, ed. Stengel, IV, *Au Lecteur*.

[2] Rouen was their "ordinaire séjour" (Bruscambille, cited by Rigal, *A. Hardy*, p. 118). Chappuzeau (*Le Théatre François*, p. 112) says of the troupe of the Marais: "Cette troupe alloit quelquefois passer l'Esté a Rouen." On January 26, 1623, the Parlement forbade a troupe of comedians to play, either in the open air or in private houses, because of the plague. On July 23, 1629, farces played by sellers of medicine were forbidden. Cf. N. Périaux, *Histoire de la ville de Rouen*, p. 421. Gaultier Garguille played at Rouen (Cf. *Revue de la Normandie*, 30 avril, 1862). In the colleges of Rouen a number of tragedies, pastoral plays, and tragi-comedies were staged in the early decades of the seventeenth century. Cf. V. Fournel, *Curiosités théatrales anciennes et modernes*, p. 75, and Boysse, *Le Théâtre des Jésuites*.

Popular and farcical literature was abundantly printed. The novels and stories offer us the names of Camus, Jacques Yver, Béroalde de Verville, Marguerite de Navarre, des Escuteaux, de Belleforest, Honoré d'Urfé, Bonaventure Desperiers, Sorel, François de Rosset, and of a number of lesser lights. Poetry was represented by the important "receuils" of du Petit-Val and by editions of Du Bellay, Louise Labé, Ronsard, Théophile, Regnier, Mellin de Sainct-Gelais, Desportes, Olénix de Mont Sacré, Courval-Sonnet, and others, and by the local muses of J. Grisel, P. de Marbeuf, J. Auvray and others. Not the least interesting are the manuals of amorous discourse and refined manners in the style of the *Précieux*. Translations from the Italian, Spanish, and Latin, as well as original works in these languages, are found. Works of devotion, historical treatises and descriptions of travels abound, but their number cannot compare with that of the *Recueils de chansons* or with the amusing and frequently obscene soliloquies, satirical productions in the grotesque manner of Bruscambille and Gaultier Garguille, in which the sly Normans of the time took delight.[1]

It is not astonishing that, in a city where literature was so abundant and varied, a number of writers, more productive than talented in many cases, should have flourished. Their forgotten labor has not been in vain: their toying with verse or their sincere interest in literature created an atmosphere which stimulated the budding genius of the young Corneille.

When, in 1634, Corneille published his play *La Veuve* under the patronage of the well-known Parisian bookseller François Targa, several contemporary poets bestowed upon him high praise in verse: this is printed in the first edition. Clamorous Georges de Scudéry opened this concert of hyperbolic homage with his famous line: "Le soleil s'est levé, retirez vous, étoiles," a prophetic utterance which

[1] Marsan, *La Pastorale dramatique*, p. 275, indicates the importance of the Rouen printing shops at that epoch: "Le *Catalogue Soleinne* nous en donne une preuve matérielle. De 1568 à 1600, sur 64 numéros environ (les éditions de Garnier mises à part) 6 seulement étaient imprimés à Rouen, contre 12 à Lyon et 24 à Paris. De 1600 à 1620, sur 104 numéros, Lyon n'en compte plus que 8, Paris que 31, tandis que Rouen s'élève a 48. Ces chiffres, sans doute, n'ont pas une valeur absolue, mais la proportion, au moins, est à retenir." In 1579 there were installed at Rouen 26 "Maîtres-imprimeurs et Libraires." In 1601 they numbered 40. On May 16, 1615, the Parlement decreed that printers' apprentices should know Latin. From that date the printers were educated men. Cf. E. Gosselin, *Simples notes sur les Imprimeurs et Libraires Rouennais*, Rouen, 1869.

he must have regretted a few years later, when, at the time of the *Cid*, his words came true. Jean de Mairet followed with an epigram, and Rotrou contributed a long Ode to this collection of conventional parlor-poetry. Boisrobert and his brother d'Ouville sang, more or less sincerely, the praise of their fellow-citizen.[1] Claveret also sent in two gems of his muse in eulogy of his future rival.

Besides these playwrights, the literary celebrities of the day, a few minor and now almost forgotten poets of Normandy paid their tribute to the rising glory of the young Corneille: J. Collardeau, du Petit-Val, and de Marbeuf. Since they belong among the personal acquaintances and literary associates of Corneille, some information about them is given here.

J. COLLARDEAU

Marty-Laveaux (I, 386) remarks: "Julien Collardeau, procureur du roi à Fontenay-le-Comte (Poitou), auteur de diverses poésies latines et françaises et notamment de quatre petits poèmes intitulés: *Tableaux des victoires du Roi*, Paris, J. Quesnel, 1630." This information may be supplemented as follows: In 1629 he sent a Pindaric ode to Bertrand de Vignolles, printed in a modern edition of the latter's *Mémoires*. He published, in 1635, a sonnet in honor of Richelieu, in the anthology *Le Sacrifice des Muses au grand Cardinal de Richelieu*, and, about 1643, *La description de Richelieu: À la mémoire du Cardinal*. He was highly praised by Balzac, in 1646, both as a prose writer and as a poet, and by Chapelain, in 1661; with the latter he corresponded at that date about a volume of verse, *Les saintes métamorphoses*, which was then ready for the printer but does not seem to have been published. He was born at Fontenay-le-Comte and died there on March 20, 1669.[2]

[1] Boisrobert and his brother d'Ouville were residing at Rouen in 1634, when *La Veuve* was published: they too wrote poems in Corneille's praise. Boisrobert, at that time temporarily exiled from the court, was canon of the Cathedral of Rouen. The *Mercure de Gaillon* (printed at the chateau of the Archbishop de Harlay) contains a "Lettre de l'Eminentissime Cardinal duc de Richelieu au religiossime archevesque de Rouen," dated January 31, 1634, beginning: "Ayant sceu par le sieur de Boisrobert." The document proves that Boisrobert wrote to Richelieu from Rouen. A letter from Balzac (*Œuvres*, I [1665], 444) shows that Boisrobert was at Rouen in May, 1634. The "achevé d'imprimer" of *La Veuve* is dated May 13, 1634. Cf. also Goujet, XVII, 69, and Magne, *Le plaisant abbé de Boisrobert*, chap. i.

[2] Cf. *Mémoires de Bertrand de Vignolles*, "Collection Méridionale," I (1869), 27–31; Dreux du Radier, *Bibliothèque du Poitou*, III, 473; Goujet, XVI, 24; Lachèvre, *Bibl. des Recueils coll.*, I, 147; *Œuvres de Balzac*, I, 530, 552; *Lettres de Chapelain*, II, 122, 231.

PIERRE DE MARBEUF

Pierre de Marbeuf, sieur de Sahurs et d'Imare, is well known as a minor poet who had his hour of ephemeral celebrity. He was born about 1596, probably near Pont de l'Arche, in Normandy, where his father was for a time "maître des eaux et des forêts." This function may have brought the Marbeufs into relation with the Corneilles. In 1625 his parents resided at Rouen. He seems to have lived for short periods in various parts of France. He left Rouen early for fear of the plague which at that time devastated the city, and established himself in Anjou. Thence he went to Orléans (1619), but must have paid frequent visits to Paris, since at that date he confesses he is in love with a Parisian girl. For her he seems to have given up his studies: "Le désir de luy plaire me fit perdre mes premières estudes," he says. Later he is found in Lorraine and in Savoie. Notwithstanding his travels, he spent a good deal of time at Rouen, for he was crowned at the Palinod in 1617, 1618, and 1620, and he participated in this annual poetic competition in at least two other years. His "stances" entitled *Anatomie de l'oeil* (1617) brought him great renown. On various occasions he was the guest of the Archbishop François de Harlay at his Château de Gaillon. The date of his death is unknown, but it must be placed after 1644, for in that year he contributed a sonnet to the *Mercure de Gaillon ou Receuil de Pièces Curieuses*, celebrating the magnificence of the archbishop's residence. Some of his publications were: poems presented at the Palinods of Rouen, where some of them received prizes; *Psaltérion Chrestien*, par Pierre de Marbeuf, sieur d'Imare, Rouen, 1618, followed by *Poésies meslées du mesme autheur; Oeuvres poétiques du sieur de Marbeuf sur l'heureux mariage de leurs altesses de Savoie*, Paris and Rouen, 1619; *Receuil des vers de M. de Marbeuf, sieur de Sahurs*, Rouen, 1628, with *Epigrammata Latine; Le Portrait de l'homme d'Estat*, Ode (Paris, 1633), reprinted in the *Sacrifice des Muses au Grand Cardinal de Richelieu*, 1635; a sonnet in the *Mercure de Gaillon*, 1644.[1]

[1] Cf. de Duranville, "Le poète Pierre de Marbeuf," *Annales de l'Acad. de Rouen*, 1873–74; Paul Olivier, *Cent Poetes Lyriques, Précieux ou Burlesques au 17e Siècle*, p. 70; de Beaurepaire, *Les Puys de Palinod de Rouen et de Caen*, pp. 152–57; A. Guiot, *Trois siècles Palinodiques;* Lachèvre, *op. cit.*, I, 236, 381; IV, 149; *Biogr. Didot*, XXXIII.

DU PETIT-VAL

Marty-Laveaux (I, 387) attributes the sonnet of *La Veuve* to Raphael du Petit-Val, printer and poet at Rouen, who composed some verses in praise of Béroalde de Verville. But the author of this poem must have been his son David, since Raphael, the father, died on January 5, 1614, and was buried in the "Eglise du Prieuré de St Lô," in the side-chapel reserved for printers and booksellers. The anthology *Le Cabinet des Muses* of 1619 contains an *Épitaphe de Raph. du Petit Val.*" His name appeared, however, upon books from his printing shop till about 1624. This is explained by the fact that his son David had not secured his license as "maître imprimeur" before that date.

David du Petit-Val also wrote poetry and was crowned nine times at the Palinods, from 1623 to 1633. The poem he sent to Corneille for *La Veuve* is a sonnet, a form which he preferred, as J. A. Guiot testifies in his *Trois Siècles Palinodiques* (II, 160): "Le sonnet paraît être le genre auquel il s'attache et dans lequel il réussit souvent au Puy de la Conception en 1625 et années suivantes." This friend of Corneille was, like his father, versed in Italian and even wrote verses in that language. In 1624 he was crowned by the judges of the Palinod for a sonnet in Italian dedicated to the Archbishop de Harlay.[1]

The first edition of *La Veuve* also contained fourteen poems signed only with initials or by unidentified authors. I will endeavor to identify most of them, with the intention of throwing light on the early literary acquaintances of Corneille.[2] They were his friends

[1] Cf. Frère, *Manuel du bibliographe Normand.*

[2] Picot, in his *Bibliographie Cornélienne*, p. 51, prints "sous toutes réserves" a note of P. Lacroix on possible identifications of the anonymous authors who contributed poems in praise of *La Veuve:* "23 pp. sont occupées par des vers que divers auteurs adressent à Corneille au sujet de sa pièce. Ces hommages sont au nombre de 26. Ils sont signés de Scudéry, Mairet, Guérente, I.G.A.E.P. (Jacques Gaillard, avocat en Parlement), de Rotrou, C.B. (Charles Beys), Du Ryer, Boisrobert, d'Ouville, Claveret, J. Collardeau, L.M.P. (Louis Mauduit, Parisien), du Petit-Val, Pillastre, de Marbeuf, de Canon, L.N. (Louis Neufgermain ou L. Nondon, auteur de la tragédie de *Cyrus*), Burnel, Marcel, Voille, Beaulieu, et A.C. (A. Chappelain ou Adam Campigny, poëtes cités en 1633 et 1634)." P. Lacroix has forgotten one of the poems, the one contributed by Villeneuve. He tries to identify only *five* unknown contributors out of *fifteen* and does not prove that Corneille had any relations with the poets whose names he gives. The author of the present article agrees with two attributions: C.B. =Charles Beys and L.M.P. =Louis Mauduit, Parisien, identifications made before Lacroix by Goujet (*Bibl. Franç.*).

at Rouen, not Parisian celebrities, and their eulogy must have been more sincere, their sympathy less feigned, their influence upon Corneille more direct. Their compliments were not offered so much in anticipation of reciprocal praise as was the case with the de Scudérys and the Claverets, who had been or expected to be praised in their turn by Corneille and compared to the immortal singers of antiquity. The following are the signatures of the several poets by names or initials: GUÉRENTE.—I.G.A.E.P.—C.B.—L.M.P.—PILLASTRE, avocat en Parlement.—VILLENEUVE.—DE CANON.—L.N.—BURNEL.—MARCEL.—VOILLE.—BEAULIEU.—A.C.

GUÉRENTE

This poet was Jean Guérente, physician at Rouen, descendant of an old family of this city. He participated in the Palinods from 1617 onward, and from 1623 to 1633 won a prize every year. The *Trois Siècles Palinodiques* (I, 54, 233) mention as subjects of his poetry: "Les Noces de Cana"; "L'Huile odorante enclose dans la Pierre"; "Un Marbre flottant sur les Eaux." He also sang of a miracle supposed to have been performed by the Archbishop de Harlay, who, it is said, quieted a storm on the Seine by the sign of the cross. He acquired some local reputation and, in 1633, became one of the judges of the Puy de l'Immaculée Conception.[1]

I.G.A.E.P.

I explain these initials as: Jacques Goujon, Avocat en Parlement. This lawyer, son of the Rouen merchant Étienne Goujon, had been Corneille's comrade at school and always remained on good terms with him. A letter of July 1, 1641, written by Corneille to Jacques Goujon, who in 1638 was promoted from lawyer by the Parlement to lawyer to the king's private council, has been published by Taschereau. The end of the document touches on details of an intimate nature, which leave no doubt that Jacques Goujon was one of the most trusted friends of the poet. In 1643 he obtained for Corneille the privilege for *Cinna*, *Polyeucte*, and *La Mort de Pompée*, and later he took care of his interests as his counsel.[2]

[1] Cf. J. B. Lecompte, *Monseigneur François de Harlay*, Rouen, 1868; also an article by Héron in *La Normandie*, July, 1898.

[2] Cf. Taschereau, *Histoire de Pierre Corneille* (3d ed.), I, 153, 252; George Dubosc, *Trois Normands*, 7.

C.B.

These are doubtless the initials of the playwright Charles Beys, famous for his exploits in the cabarets (1610–59). His bibliography has occasioned no little confusion. I will endeavor here to disentangle and supplement it: In 1629, and not in 1635, as is generally said, he published *L'Ospital des Fous*, Paris, Toussainct Quinet. This play was imitated from the Spanish and was republished in 1653 with a different title, *Les illustres Fous*. His other plays are: *Les Jaloux sans sujet*, 1635, and *Céline*, 1637. He contributed a number of poems to the "receuils" of the time.

The Mazarinade: *Les vrais sentiments des bons François touchant la Paix: À la Reine Régente* (1649), signed C.B., is doubtless by Charles Beys. In the same year he published a heroic poem: *Les Triomphes de Louys le Juste XIIIe du nom.* These works were followed by *Oeuvres poétiques* (1652) and by *Stances sur le départ de Monseigneur le premier Président* (1652).

CONTESTED ATTRIBUTIONS

The *Comédie des Chansons* (1640) has been attributed to Beys and to Timothée de Chillac.

The play *L'Amant libéral* has been ascribed to Beys and to Guérin de Bouscal. The satirical poem *Le Gouvernement présent ou Éloge de son Éminence ou La Milliade* has been attributed to Beys, to Favereau (a counselor at the "Cour des Aides") and to d'Estelon (son of the Maréchal de Saint-Luc).[1]

L.M.P.

These initials have long been known as those of Louis Mauduit, Parisien. He was probably the son of the composer Jacques Mauduit (1557–1627), friend of Baïf and founder of the Académie de Musique during the reign of Charles IX. In his youth he was a close friend of Théophile de Viaud, but, frightened by his condemnation, he left the Libertines and was converted to a stricter orthodoxy. In 1626 he contributed to a volume of poetry by various authors, *Le Banquet*

[1] Cf. Lintilhac, *Histoire de la Comédie*, Vol. I; Lachèvre, *Bibl. des Rec. coll.*, I, 10; II, 150; III, 214; IV, 71; *Bibliographie des Mazarinades;* de Léris, *Dictionnaire*, p. 393; Goujet, XVI, 293; La Vallière, *Bibl.*, II, 259.

d'Apolon et des Muses, signing his poems L.M.P. In 1625 and 1628 he praised Nicolas Frénicle in verse preceding the latter's *Oeuvres*. In 1631 he published a volume of poetry, *Izabelle, amours de L.M.P.* Another publication gave his name in full, *Les Dévotions de L. Mauduit P* (a second edition, 1633).[1]

PILLASTRE AVOCAT EN PARLEMENT

To the Norman family of this name belonged the Abbé Pierre Pillastre, historian. Pillastre, lawyer at the court of the Parlement, was probably one of the colleagues of Corneille at Rouen.[2]

VILLENEUVE

Jean Cézar de Villeneuve did not sign his contribution, but he wrote to Corneille:

> Recois ces vers dont *Villeneuve*,
> Ravi des beautés de ta Veuve,
> A fait hommage à ton savoir.

J. C. de Villeneuve was a Provençal nobleman, belonging to a celebrated and ancient family. Among his ancestors he counted Éléon de Villeneuve, grandmaster of Rhodes (†1346). His oldest brother, Arnaud de Villeneuve, was made a marquis by Louis XIII in 1612. He himself had the titles of "sieur de la Garde de Freinet," and "sieur de la Motte." He had the reputation of being one of the most cultivated gentlemen of letters of his time. Malherbe, with whom he was very intimate, praises him in one of his latest odes:

> La Garde, tes doctes écrits
> Montrent le soin que tu as pris
> A savoir toutes belles choses;
> Et ta prestance et tes discours
> Etalent un heureux concours
> De toutes les grâces écloses . . . .

A letter of Malherbe to Villeneuve mentions "le judicieux Du Vair, notre commun ami." Guillaume Colletet, who dedicated to him his poem *Les Bergers*, wrote:

[1] Cf. Goujet, XV, 301; Viollet-le-Duc, *Bibl. poétique.*

[2] The Abbé Pierre Pillastre (1600–1666) was the secretary of Jacques Camus de Pont-Carré, bishop of Séez. He published a *De Ecclesia diocesis Sagiensis* (1646–52), 5 vols. His manuscript works are in the library of M. Adolant-Desnas. Cf. Frère, *Manuel du bibliographe Normand*, II, and G. Grente, *Jean Bertaut*, 1903.

Cher Villeneuve, à qui les doctes soeurs,
Ont à l'envie prodigué leurs douceurs,
Gentil esprit, âme la plus polie
D'entre tous ceux dont l'amitié me lie. . . . .
—*Les Divertissements*, 1631.

He was also an intimate of Louis Mauduit (see above), who dedicated to him some of the poetry of his *Izabelle*. Verses of both are found in the two volumes: *L'Impiété des Déistes, Athées et Libertins de ce temps, combattue et renversée*, etc., by Frère Martin Mersenne, 1624; and in the second volume, which appeared at the same time, but with a slight change of title: *L'Impiété des Déistes et des plus subtils Libertins découverte et refutée par raisons de Théologie et de Philosophie*, etc., 1624.

The works of Villeneuve were probably never printed. Malherbe eulogized his *Histoire Sainte* and testified that his *Carnaval des honnêtes gens* had obtained great success at the court. The magistrate, libertine, and playwright, Nicolas Frénicle, who was praised by Villeneuve in a complimentary poem in his *Oeuvres poétiques* 1625), returned the compliment by eulogizing one of Villeneuve's poems: *Le Poème de la Tulippe*, which probably does not exist in print.[1]

DE CANON

This poet-lawyer was one of the colleagues of Corneille. He has left manuscript, *Mémoires du sieur de Canon, avocat en Parlement de Normandie*. He was probably related to the celebrated lawyer, Pierre de Canon, author of the *Commentaire sur les coutumes de Lorraine* (1634), who was ennobled by the Duke of Lorraine in 1626, "en considération de sa probité, doctrine et capacité, et de l'estime et réputation en laquelle il estoit entre les premiers de sa profession."[2]

L.N.

These initials probably stand for Martin Le Noir, a priest of the order of the Augustins of Rouen, an author and a poet. As Corneille's brother, Antoine, entered that order in 1627, Le Noir must

[1] Cf. *Dictionnaire des Moréri*, VIII; Goujet, XVII, 27; Lachèvre, *Le Procès de Théophile*, II, 100, 146; *Œuvres de Malherbe*, ed. Lalanne, I, 285, 355.

[2] Cf. Floquet, *Histoire du Parlement de Normandie*, IV, 422, n. 2; *Biographie Michaud*, Suppl., LX, 91.

have been acquainted with the Corneille family. Le Noir published: *L'Uranoplée ou Navigation du Lict de Mort au port de Vie*, 1616; *Le naïf image de l'envie* (with stances and sonnets) *presenté en étrennes à toute la très noble et antique maison de Mss. les généreux Martels*, 1611; *L'Anté-Christ*, a poem of which at least three editions are in existence; *Apologie contre la résolution de la Sanctification du Sainct Dimanche et autre festes*, Rouen, without date; *La franche acceptation du deffy faict à frère Martin Le Noir, prieur des Augustins par certain calomniateur anonyme*, without date; *Quatorze Sermons prêchés à Rouen*, without date; *Sermon funèbre prononcé au conduit mortuaire de très haut et puissant Seigneur Messire François Martel, le 4 juillet, 1631*, Rouen, 1631. The date of the death of Martin Le Noir has been erroneously accepted as 1620, for, as shown by the last publication mentioned here, he preached at the burial of François Martel in 1631.[1]

BURNEL

Some of the works of this poet are: *Ode presentée à Monseigneur le prince de Conty en la maison de ville sur son arrivée à Paris.* Signed: Burnel, Paris, 1649; a Mazarinade: *Les Remerciements de la France pour la Paix, à Monseigneur le Prince de Conty*, Paris, 1649.[2]

GUILLAUME MARCEL

This friend of Corneille, whose real name was Masquerel, belonged to the order of the Oratorians and was professor of rhetoric at Rouen at the time of the publication of *La Veuve*. In 1641 he was teaching the same subject at the college founded by the Archbishop de Harlay. Later he became professor of eloquence at the Collège des Grassins in Paris. He was born about 1610 at Bayeux and died as curate of Basly (Calvados) in 1702. His works are numerous. A few are listed here: *Pax Promissa, sive pro Perpiniano capto oratio panegyrica*, Rouen, 1643; *In Eloquentiam curoe primoe*, Paris, 1646; *La Seureté catholique ou abrégé de controverse*, Caen, 1662; *Oraison funèbre de haut et puissant seigneur Odet de Harcourt*, Caen 1661; *La censure de la censure des tièdes ou remarques sur deux sermons de Du Bosc*, Caen, 1670; *Relation de ce qui s'est passé en la canonisation de St.Pierre*

[1] Cf. Oursel, *Biographie Normande;* Frère, *Manuel du bibliographe Normand.*

[2] Cf. *Bibliographie des Mazarinades; Catalogue des Imprimés de la Bibl. Nation.*

d'Alcantara, Caen, 1670; *Histoire de la solemnité de la canonisation de St. François de Borgia*, Caen, 1672; *Histoire de la suppression du prêche de Basly*, Caen, 1680.[1]

VOILLE

This poet's full name was Voille de Bruyères. He wrote complimentary verse to Pierre du Ryer. In the *Mémoire de Mahelot* the stage setting is given of a play by a "sieur Desbruyeres," entitled *Le Romant de Paris*. Is not this play, which seems lost, the work of Voille de Bruyères?[2]

BEAULIEU

Alais, sieur de Beaulieu, published in 1634 a volume of poetry, *Les Divertisements d'Alais, sieur de Beaulieu*, dedicated to Monsieur de l'Orme, father of the renowned Marion de l'Orme. He was in relation with Jacques Vallée, sieur des Barreaux, the famous libertine and poet. It is probably this Beaulieu who published the novels: *Les Aventures de Polyandre et Théoxène, par le sieur de Beaulieu* (1624), and *La Solitude amoureuse* (1631).[3]

A.C.

Lachèvre reads these letters as representing A. Chappelain, but this poet—probably a Parisian printer, publisher of Malherbe's works—is only known through a single poem signed by his full name and by one signed A.C. attributed to him. Is it not much more probable that the poem for *La Veuve* was written by Antoine Corneille, the brother of Pierre? In 1634 Antoine was twenty-three years old. He made his début as a poet at the Palinod of Rouen in 1636 with an ode in honor of Saint Martinien. He was crowned several times at these annual competitions and published in 1647 a volume of *Poésies Chrestiennes*.[4]

[1] Cf. Oursel, *Biogr. Normande;* Frère, *Manuel;* Lebreton, *Biographie Rouennaise;* Lecompte, *Mgr. de Harlay*, 1868.

[2] Cf. H. Carrington Lancaster, *Pierre du Ryer*, p. 9; Mahelot, cited by Rigal, *Le Théâtre français avant la période classique.*

[3] Cf. Lachèvre, *Le Proces de Théophile*, II, 209.

[4] Cf. Lachèvre, *Bibl. des Receuils coll.*, I, 143, and IV, 88. The *Poesies Chrestiennes* were reprinted in 1877, in the collection of the "Bibliophiles Rouennais." The *Trois Siècles Palinodiques* give information as to Antoine Corneille's début.

Thus we see Corneille in his early period surrounded and praised by not a few literary friends and acquaintances: de Marbeuf, J. Collardeau, David du Petit-Val, Jean Guérente, de Canon, Martin Le Noir, Guillaume Marcel, his brother Antoine, all of them living at Rouen or near that city. To these must be added the celebrated archbishop of Rouen, Monseigneur François de Harlay (1590–1653). The Latin poem which Corneille wrote for the *Epinicia Musarum Eminentissimo Cardinali de Richelieu* (1634) was an answer to an invitation of the prelate to write verse in honor of Louis XIII and Richelieu. He was considered one of the most eminent minds of his time: "Franciscus de Harlay, vir linguarum dives, doctrinâ et auctoritate stupendus," says Abraham Golnitzi in his *Ulysses Bellico-Gallico*, p. 209. On September 8, 1618, at the age of twenty-eight, he succeeded the Cardinal de Joyeuse as archbishop of Rouen and for many decades protected letters, art, and learning. He was theologian, controversialist, historian, orator, and writer of Latin poetry.[1]

In 1630 he founded at Rouen one of the first public libraries of France. One of the buildings belonging to the Cathedral was transformed into a reading-room, where from forty to fifty thousand volumes were put at the disposal of the clergy and the inhabitants. The *Diaire du Chancelier Séguier* mentions this collection of books: "En la dicte bibliothèque on s'est longuement arresté, sans néanmoins en veoir les particularitez; elle a esté donée par le dict archevesque au chapitre de son eglize cathedrale pour les inciter à l'estude. . . . Il y a assez grand nombre de volumes, que le dict archevesque estime 40 ou 50 mil mal couvertz" (p. 127).

In the château at Gaillon he assembled the circle called "L'Académie de Saint Victor," which he had founded at Paris. There gathered in erudite meetings the notables of the clergy of Rouen, among others Antoine Gaulde, "vicaire-général" of Rouen, Hellenist and poet, and the canon Robert le Cornier de Ste.-Hélène, "grand-vicaire," occasional poet and protector of letters. But the most important member of the Academy, from the literary point of view, was the prolific writer and witty friend of St. Francis de Sales, Jean-Pierre Camus, bishop of Belley (1582–1652). He came to Rouen in 1629

[1] He addressed to his academicians a Latin poem, *Solatium Musarum*, and collaborated in the *Epinicia Musarum* of 1634.

as Abbé d'Aulnay and vicar-general to the archbishop. His fame, based upon a hundred novels, stories, and miscellaneous edifying writings, as well as upon his untiring apostolic zeal, eloquence, and wit, made him one of the most prominent literary personalities of the day.

Some other writers stood near to Corneille, Pierre de Brinon, for example, a counselor at the Parlement of Rouen, who died in 1658. It would have been very strange if Corneille had not had relations with a fellow-citizen who belonged to the same social milieu of magistrates as himself and who had published the tragi-comedy *L'Ephésienne* and other plays translated from Buchanan. François d'Eudemare of Rouen, judge of the Palinods, after having been crowned many times himself, was certainly not unknown to Corneille. He was a historian and a devotional writer as well as a poet, and lived long enough to see the initial success of Corneille, for he died of the plague July 2, 1635. The learned and poetical society of Corneille's native city counted at the time many other men of science, wit, and literary taste. The priest Nicolas Guillebert published eight or nine volumes and was one of the most successful competitors in the Palinods; Jean Titelouse (†1633) was the most celebrated organ-player of his time and an occasional poet.

A Rouen playwright, Le Vert, prided himself on his friendship with his famous compatriot. In the *Avis au Lecturer* of his tragi-comedy *Aricidie ou le Mariage de Tite* (1646), he defends the custom of writing prefaces, and adds: "Je n'ignore pas que cette mienne opinion ne puisse être condamnée de quelques uns; mais je sais bien aussi qu'elle est suivie de beaucoup d'autres, et que j'ai pour modèle et pour partisan (comme pour ami et pour compatriote, dont je ne tire pas une petite vanité) le grand maître de l'art qui dans *Cinna* et le *Polyeucte* n'a pas jugé hors de propos de préparer ses lecteurs par des commencements semblables" (cf. Marty-Laveaux, III, 367).

Claude Sarrau, who had the reputation of being one of the most erudite scholars of his epoch, must be counted among Corneille's early friends. One of his letters to Corneille is extant and has been published (Marty-Laveaux, X, 438). He lived at Rouen, was a Counsellor at the Parlement of Normandy, and became intimate with Corneille during this period. Through this acquaintance,

Corneille must have learned about the prominent personalities of the learned society of Europe, for, as early as 1627, Claude Sarrau corresponded with Hugo Grotius and with other celebrities.[1]

Taschereau in his *Histoire de Pierre Corneille* (II, 69) has drawn attention to some of Corneille's friends. Among them some were, or had been, inhabitants of his native city; the Pascals, Lucas, "connu pour habile homme de tout ce qu'il y a d'habiles gens à l'Académie" (Boursault); Voyer d'Argenson, later French ambassador to Venice, and the poet Georges de Brébeuf (1617–61). The important literary friendship which grew up between him and Corneille and his indebtedness to his friend's work have been the object of thoroughgoing study.[2] A passage in Brébeuf's *Correspondance* sheds light on their personal relations. The plague was devastating Rouen, as on many previous occasions during the seventeenth century, and Brébeuf wanted to leave the stricken city: "Enfin, il faut tascher de m'en tirer. Je vous ay déjà dit que Mm. de Corneille m'offrent une place dans leur carosse. Le mauvais temps et ma mauvaise santé m'obligent à les attendre" (I, 72).

Both poets had great reverence for Madame Laurence de Bellefonds, an aristocratic and cultivated abbess, who reorganized in 1648 the convent of Notre Dame des Anges at Rouen. She was the author of various works, among others of a *Traduction des hymnes de l'Église.* It is said that she had a merited reputation as a tasteful judge of verse and that both Corneille and Brébeuf owed much to her enlightened counsel.[3]

As not the least among Corneille's literary acquaintances must be ranked the distinguished Rouen family de Campion. When Alexandre de Campion, diplomat, poet, and mayor of Rouen, published his book *Les Hommes illustres* (1657), Corneille addressed to him a preliminary sonnet which contains some proud lines:

> J'ai quelqu'art d'arracher les grands noms du tombeau,
> De leur rendre un destin plus durable et plus beau,
> De faire qu'après moi l'avenir se souvienne.

[1] Cf. *Claudii Saravii, Senatoris parisiensis, epistolae* (1654) for letters to Saumaise, Bochart, Gronovius, Fabricius, and others.

[2] Harmand, *Essai sur la vie et les œuvres de Georges de Brébeuf*, pp. 50, 277, 409, 461.

[3] Her dates are from 1612 to 1683. She was the daughter of the Marquis de Bellefonds, "lieutenant-général des armées du roy." Cf. Bouhours, *Vie de Mme de Bellefonds*, 1686; Farin, *Histoire de la ville de Rouen*, III (1668), 450; R. Harmand, *Essai sur Georges de Brébeuf*, p. 21; Oursel, *Biographie Normande.*

Le mien semble avoir droit à l'immortalité,
Mais ma gloire est autant au-dessous de la tienne
Que la fable, en effet, cède à la vérité.

Corneille must have been acquainted also with the two brothers of this important personage, Henri de Campion, author of interesting *Mémoires*, and the prior Nicolas de Campion, who also was a worshiper of the Muses. A member of this family, Louis Martainville de Marsilly, married in 1686 a daughter of Thomas Corneille.

Among Pierre Corneille's most devoted friends the satirical poet Louis Petit stands out. In his youth he had been one of the habitués of the Hôtel de Rambouillet and later, when "receveur général des domaines et bois du roy" at Rouen, he remained intimate with some "gentilhommes de lettres" like the Duke of Montausier, later governor of Normandy, and the Marquis de Saint-Aignan. He wrote verses to Corneille under the pastoral disguise of Damon, followed him to Paris in 1662 and after his death published an edition of his works.[1]

We might also touch upon the well-known friendly relations of Corneille with the Jesuits of his native city, in whose school he was educated. Among them he liked especially those who had a taste for literature. To his former teacher, the Jesuit Delidel, author of the *Théologie des Saints* and poet in Latin, he dedicated the poem beginning "Savant et pieux écrivain, Qui jadis de ta propre main M'as élevé sur le Parnasse." One of his most intimate friends was the Jesuit and playwright Charles de la Rue, whose Latin poems he translated and who was probably the godfather of his third son, Charles Corneille.[2]

It is strange, no doubt, that Corneille never participated in the annual contests in religious poetry at the Puy de l'Immaculée Conception of Rouen, where both his brothers presented verse; he may have been present at various occasions, as in 1640, when he thanked

[1] His works are: *Discours satyriques et moraux ou Satyres générales*, Rouen, 1685 (republished by Olivier, 1883); *Dialogues satyriques et moraux*, Rouen, 1687, in prose. He left a manuscript *Les Oeuvres poétiques de Louis Petit*, 1658. A part of it, in "patois Normand" was published with the title *La Muse Normande* by Chassau (1853). Louis Petit sent poetry to some of the *receuils* of the time and to the *Mercure Galant*. Cf. Goujet, *Bibl.*, XVIII; *Revue de Rouen*, 1850; *Précis de l'Académie de Rouen*, 1827; Lebreton, *Biographie Rouennaise*.

[2] Cf. Picot, *Bibliographie Cornélienne;* Marty-Laveaux, X.

the judges in the name of Jacqueline Pascal. The reasons for his attitude are easy to understand as far as his early years are concerned. At that time he was a rather worldly young man, belonging to the "gaie jeunesse" of Rouen, as is proved by his early poetry and by the risky and frequently indecent expressions of his *Clitandre* and his *Mélite* (erased from the editions after 1658). The time when he will versify the *Imitation* is as yet far off. But the Palinods always interested him, no doubt, as one of the literary activities of his native city.

The names of the authors cited above, although they do not exhaust the list of Corneille's early literary acquaintances, are sufficient to prove the existence at Rouen of a considerable literary milieu at the time of Corneille's early plays. It is plain that a brisk literary life flourished in Normandy and its capital during the early decades of the seventeenth century, powerfully helped by the local development of printing, by the success in letters of a group of Normans—Malherbe, Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, Bertaut and Boisrobert—and by the existence at Rouen of an academy counting among its members Camus, the Archbishop de Harlay, and a number of local celebrities. Rather than as a young man almost ignorant of literature, who, by a stroke of genius was changed from a prosaic lawyer into a poet, we view Corneille in his early years as spurred on by his surroundings and by his friends to the preparation of his life's work. A sympathetic and informed reader of the literature of his times, as well as of antiquity and foreign countries, he associated early with the kindred spirits among the local savants, poets, and playwrights, and enjoyed from the beginning their esteem and their praise. Without yielding to literary determinism, without pretending to explain Corneille as an artist and a creator solely by his surroundings and the early influences he underwent, it is yet justifiable to consider him as the most perfect interpreter of the literary movement of his native city and of his province.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

EPIC UNITY AS DISCUSSED BY SIXTEENTH-CENTURY CRITICS IN ITALY

The ideas of the critical writers of the sixteenth century in Italy on the question of unity in the epic have never been tabulated, although the dramatic unities, first promulgated by these writers, have been discussed at length. It is the purpose of this article to give, in chronological order, the various theories on the subject of epic unity propounded by the critical writers in the half-century from Vida (1527) to Castelvetro (1570), a period in which the question was variously treated until it reached in Castelvetro its final development in the idea of the three unities.

Inasmuch as in such an investigation one cannot for a moment lose sight of Aristotle's dictum on this question of unity, it would seem advantageous to call to mind what he has to say. At the outset it should be understood that the unities are deduced primarily from the practice of tragedy and were applied only secondarily to the epic. This is particularly true of what little is said regarding the unities of time and place in the epic, but Aristotle discusses the whole subject of unity chiefly with regard to tragedy, and much of what his followers have repeated is written with an eye to the example of tragic unity.

In the *Poetics*, the question of unity receives a longer treatment than many of the other points discussed. By the rule of beauty a poetic creation must have at the same time unity and plurality. If it is too small the whole is perceived but not the parts; if too large the parts are perceived but not the whole. On this principle a whole such as the Trojan War is too vast in its compass even for epic treatment; it cannot be grasped by the mind and incurs the risk of becoming a series of detached incidents. The Platonic idea of an organism evidently underlies Aristotle's rules concerning unity. It is especially evident in one passage: "The construction of its stories should be like that in a drama; they should be based on a single action, one that is a complete whole in itself, with a

beginning, middle, and end, so as to enable the work to produce its own proper pleasure, with all the organic unity of a living creature."[1]

The unity of a plot does not consist in having one man as its subject; an infinity of things befalls that one man, some of which cannot be reduced to unity, and there are many actions of one man which cannot be made to form one action. Homer, in writing the *Odyssey*, did not make the poem cover all that befell his hero, but he represented one action with its several incidents so closely connected that the transposal or withdrawal of any one of them would have interfered with the continuity of the whole. The epic, being in narrative form, may describe a number of simultaneous incidents, and these, if germane to the subject, increase the body of the poem without destroying its unity. The general law of unity laid down in the *Poetics* for an epic poem is almost the same as for tragedy, but the epic, being of wider compass, can admit many episodes which serve to fill in the pauses of the action, or to diversify the interest, or to embellish the narrative. The introduction of episodes, however, conduces to the result that there is less unity in the imitation of epic poets, inasmuch as from one epic many tragic plots may be derived. It is an evident fact, however, that if a single story were treated it would seem curt when briefly told, and thin and extenuated when prolonged to the usual epic length. On this point Professor Bywater translates Aristotle as follows: "In saying that there is less unity in an epic, I mean an epic made up of a plurality of actions, in the same way as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have such parts, each one of them in itself of some magnitude; yet the structure of the two Homeric poems is as perfect as can be, and the action in them as nearly as possible one action."[2]

In some inferior epics, although there is a certain unity in the story, it is not of the right kind, as the action consists of a plurality of parts, each of them easily detached from the rest of the work. Several tragedies may be made from a single epic of this type, whereas the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* does not supply materials for more than one or two. This emphatic assertion of the unity of action in the Homeric epic is not quite in harmony with statements made

[1] I. Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, Oxford, 1909, p. 71.

[2] Cf. Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

elsewhere in the *Poetics*. The story of the *Iliad*, for instance, is said to contain a plurality of actions.[1] This plurality of action is not, one can feel assured, condoned by Aristotle; on the contrary, to the extent that there is a plurality of action, to that same extent are the poems of Homer comparable to the "inferior epics."

Homer did not attempt to treat the Trojan War in its entirety —though it was a whole with a definite beginning and end—through a feeling apparently that it was too long a story to be grasped in one view, or, if not that, too complicated from the variety of incident. As it is, he has selected one section of the whole, bringing in many other matters as episodes, as, for example, the catalogue of the ships.

The only unity enjoined by Aristotle for the epic is the unity of action which we have just discussed. As everyone knows, the doctrine of the unity of time is based on one passage in the *Poetics* where Aristotle states that the epic is of greater length than tragedy, "which is due to its having no fixed limit of time, whereas tragedy endeavors to keep as far as possible within a single circuit of the sun."[2] As to the length of the epic, it must be possible for the beginning and the end of the work to be comprehended in one view, a condition which will be fulfilled if the poem is shorter than the old epics, and about as long as the series of tragedies offered for one hearing. Aristotle is here speaking merely of the material length of the epic, and not of any unity of time. He is referring to the real length of the work itself, a length measured by the number of lines a poem would take up in a book, or the number of hours required for recitation. Aristotle never loses sight of the obvious fact that the epic (the *Iliad*, for instance) extends its length to several thousand lines, whereas a tragedy rarely exceeds some sixteen hundred lines. This difference in length between the epic

[1] "One should also remember what has been said more than once, and not write a tragedy on an epic body of incident (i.e., with a plurality of stories in it) by attempting to dramatize, for instance, the entire body of the *Iliad*" (Bywater, chap. xviii, p. 53); and again (chap. xxvi): "We must remember that there is less unity in the imitation of epic poets, as is proved by the fact that any one work of theirs supplies matter for several tragedies. In saying that there is less unity in an epic, I mean an epic made up of a plurality of actions, in the same way as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have many such parts, each one of them in itself of some magnitude" (Bywater, p. 91).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

and the tragedy is, for Aristotle, the natural consequence of another kind of difference, i.e., the fact that the action in a Greek tragedy is as a rule kept within a limit of some twenty-four hours, whereas that of the epic may extend over weeks, months, or years.

With this difference, therefore, in the extent of the action, in the quantum of matter to be included in the story, it is only natural that there should be a corresponding difference in the length of the external form in the two cases. Assuming this correspondence, Aristotle explains the great length of an epic compared with a tragedy, as due to the length of time over which the epic action extends. In other words, he passes from the idea of the actual length, the actual time required for the recitation, to that of the imaginary time covered by the action of the poem, apparently with the tacit assumption that the two things are so closely connected that the one may serve to explain the other. It would be absolutely wrong to deduce, however, that Aristotle is anywhere making the time of the actual recitation of the epic coincide with the time of presentation of a series of tragedies acted in a single day. The epic, then, must be a whole, but not too long a whole. This condition will be fulfilled if the epic is about the length of a trilogy, and thus considerably shorter than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. He evidently thinks that an epic on the old Homeric scale of length would prove too great a strain on the memory and attention of the literary public of his own time.

The discussion of unity may be divided into two main topics: the fundamental and basic idea that the plot should deal with one action—an Aristotelian precept which is generally denominated the "unity of action"; and, secondly, the so-called unity of time, derived by critics from the first, and bearing such an intimate relation to it that at times it becomes impossible to separate the two, although in this article an effort will be made to consider them singly. As a subdivision of the unity of action the question of the introduction of episodes will be treated. The word "episode" is used by the sixteenth-century critics in its literal meaning, that is, a "coming in besides," a digression or incident outside the plot or main action (generally called the *favola*) but related to it, and forming with the plot the whole narration or story.

Trissino, in treating the question of the unity of action, interprets Aristotle more broadly than many sixteenth-century critics. Although in his dedication to Charles V preceding the *Italia liberata* Trissino says that he intends to treat one and only one of the many actions of Justinian, he adds that he purposes to commence at the beginning of the war and finish at the end, or, in other words, he considers the entire war as a unit, the treatment of which, he thinks, finds complete justification in Aristotelian rules. It will be remembered, however, that Aristotle commends Homer for not attempting to deal with the Trojan War in its entirety, and adds that Homer had refrained from so doing through a feeling, apparently, that the story was of too great length to be grasped in one view. Trissino, although fully aware of Aristotle's dictum on this subject,[1] interprets this in such a way as to justify the selection of an entire war, provided that, by so doing, the poem still remain of ordinary length and be not too complicated by variety of incident, and provided that the beginning and the end can still be grasped in one view. The words of Aristotle seem, however, to be capable of the single inference that he considered any war as a subject too vast for a single poem.

Robortelli, in his commentary on Aristotle, repeats the latter's doctrine regarding the organism by saying that the epic embraces a single, perfect, and complete action, and that, if it be complete in every part like some animal, it is beautiful and affords pleasure. If an author constitutes many actions in the epic, he departs from its proper art, for it ought to be a single, simple action.[2] In apparent opposition to the latter statement, he asserts that a tragic action ought to be simple, but that the epic makes the nature of its action complicated.[3] He undoubtedly has in mind, however, the introduction of episodes and not any complexity of the plot proper, for he maintains[4] that the epic, which is legitimately increased by episodes, is longer than tragedy because it includes more episodes. He seems to use the word *actio* in the sense that Minturno employs the word *narratio* or story, as is more evident in the following passage:

[1] Trissino, "De arte poetica," in *Tutte le opere*, Verona, 1729, p. 113.

[2] Robortelli, *In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes*, Florentiae, 1548, p. 320.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

"In the epic many parts of the action are completed at the same time; episodes are parts of the action, and each one has a perfect and complete action in itself,"[1] yet the epic as a whole seems to be a single action. Some, ignorant of the reason (*rationem*) and the art (*artificium*) of the heroic poem, have followed all the deeds of one man which were either accomplished at one time or in the space of many years. The action in such a poem is not one but becomes manifold (*multiplicem*) and diverse.[2] Such a poem is not to be condemned from the point of view of length of time, because, in his opinion, in its imitation the epic may legitimately embrace matters covering not only a day and night but many days, months, and years—a very flexible and elastic freedom when compared to the limits imposed by later critics, such as Minturno; it would be condemned only as offending the unity of action, the only unity Robortelli recognizes.

Bernardo Segni maintains that the plot is one and perfect when it relates a single action.[3] In this way it can be said that the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid* are a single action. "Let it not disturb us if in these poems many matters are found, because such things are episodes." But the action of each of these poems is a single action, he repeats. The episodes treat of things outside the action which the poet purposes to imitate, which, nevertheless, are not entirely separate from it but agree with it in some part. Following the ideas of Robortelli ("Rubertello," as he calls him), he makes the statement that the heroic poem imitates an action lasting several years.

In the work of Giraldi Cinthio defending the *romanzi* we find a far different idea concerning unity from that which we have met heretofore. The writer of the *romanzi* chooses a subject not of one action of one man but of "one or more illustrious actions of one or more excellent men."[4] Ariosto and Boiardo, he believes, have fulfilled these conditions. The subject-matter of the *romanzi* is different from the works of Virgil and Homer because both of these have

[1] Robortelli, *In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes*, Florentiae, 1548, p. 320.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[3] *Rettorica et Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di Greco in lingua vulgare Fiorentina*, Firenze, 1549, p. 300.

[4] G. Giraldi Cinthio, *Discorsi*, Vinegia, 1554, p. 8.

undertaken to imitate a single action of a single man, whereas Ariosto and Boiardo have imitated many actions not only of one man but of many.[1] "And although it appears that Aristotle blames in his *Poetics* those who wrote a *Theseid* or a *Heracleid*, he does not condemn them (if his words are well considered) on account of the composition or the subject, but because it appeared to these authors whom he blames that in writing the deeds of a single man they were making a poem of a single action, an opinion certainly far from true, and worthy of being blamed."[2]

"All the poetic compositions which contain deeds of heroes are not restricted within the bounds which Aristotle has imposed upon the poets who write poems of a single action."[3] Giraldi contends that it is better to follow many actions than a single action, because it seems that this method is more adapted to the composition in the form of *romanzi*, for this diversity of action carries with it a variety which is delightful, and furnishes ample opportunity for the introduction of episodes or pleasing digressions and events which could never fittingly happen in that manner of poetry which describes a single action.[4] Despite this greater freedom in choice of subject, he cautions the poet to keep in mind the harmonious arrangement of the matter. "And this disposition ought not to be alone considered in the principal parts, which are beginning, middle, and end, but in every smaller section of these parts."[5] He adopts as an excellent simile that of the body, comparing it to a composition, as follows: "Just as a man's body is made of bones, nerves, flesh, and skin, so the compositions of good poets, who write *romanzi*, ought to have parts in the body of the poem which correspond to the parts of the human body."[6] The sections should be joined to each other like parts of the body, though in a manner different from that of Homer and Virgil.

The writers of *romanzi*, having taken the actions of many from the beginning, have not been able to continue one matter from canto to canto, on account of the fact that all of them are intimately connected. But it has been necessary for them, after speaking of one of their characters, to pass to another, breaking off the narration

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

of the first and entering into the deeds of the other, and with this order to continue until the end, "a thing which they have done with marvelous art."[1] An especially interesting passage shows Giraldi's ideas regarding the nature of the episodes that may be treated. "There can be introduced into the compositions," he says, "loves, unexpected events, wrongs, vices, offenses, defences, deceits; deeds of courtesy, justice, liberality, virtue, treachery, faith, loyalty, etc., and such other episodes; and there can be introduced such variety and delight that the poem will become most pleasing."[2]

Giraldi does not believe that the story of a whole life would be a poor composition or lacking in pleasure or utility. "For we willingly read in prose the life of Themistocles, Coriolanus, or Romulus, and of other excellent men; why ought it to be less pleasing and less profitable to read it composed in verse by a noble and wise poet? For he knows how the lives of heroes ought to be written in verse for an example to the world, like history."[3] As the Italian has its own forms of poetry different from those of other tongues and other countries, the Tuscan poet ought not to be confined by the limits within which the Greeks and the Latins were constrained but ought to proceed along the paths which the best Italian poets have indicated, with the same authority which the Greeks and Latins had in their language. "And this is the reason that I have many times smiled at those who have wished to place the writers of *romanzi* under the laws of art given by Aristotle and Horace, not considering the fact that neither one nor the other knew this tongue, nor this manner of composing."[4] Giraldi, nevertheless, does not lightly cast aside the precepts of the ancients. "I do not say this, however, because I blame the precepts which are necessary to good composition, as are those which Aristotle, Cicero, and the other ancients gave."[5]

Pigna's ideas are somewhat similar to those of Giraldi, although it is interesting to see that there are differences between the two which one would not expect to find, in view of the fact that Pigna bewails loudly the appropriation of his ideas by his teacher. Pigna, too, contends that *romanzi* are different from the older epic, chiefly

[1] G. Giraldi Cinthio, *Discorsi*, Vinegia, 1554, p. 41.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 43. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 20. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 45. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

on account of the fact that where the Greek and Latin poets speak continuously the Italians interrupt the course of their poems from time to time.[1] He, too, although with less elaborateness, considers[2] the epic like an animal composed of substance and extraneous things (*accidenti*), the *accidenti* being the episodes which are digressions placed outside the principal action.[3] As in a good composition the members will be proportionate, so in a poor one they will be prolonged where it is unnecessary.[4] He recognizes, however, that the epic action is essentially one action of one person.[5] He differs from Giraldi in saying that, although the *romanzi* are adapted to depict many deeds of many men, they devote themselves especially to one man who is celebrated above all the others, and thus they agree with the epics in depicting a single person. But this is not the case, he adds, when it is a question of taking a single fact, because the writers of *romanzi* treat as many actions as they deem suitable, nor do the *romanzi* agree with the epics in making one action supreme and the others subordinate.[6] Furthermore, Pigna, in direct opposition to the statement of Giraldi Cinthio, asserts that Aristotle has been the guide in *romanzi*, although he did not speak of them.[7] He contends also that Ariosto followed classic models. "And although the love of Angelica could have been treated differently, nevertheless it was related in this manner following the example of the *Iliad*."[8] "And to show that he has followed the Greek and Latin poets equally, he took care to begin his poem with the lines of the *Iliad* and to conclude it according to the form of the *Aeneid*."[9]

Bernardo Tasso, writing to Benedetto Varchi under date of March 6, 1559,[10] reduces the whole question to the consideration of the effect produced. "If Aristotle were born in this age and should see the most pleasing poem of Ariosto's, knowing the force of custom and realizing that it furnishes so much delight, I do not know whether he would change his opinion and consent that a heroic poem could

[1] G. Battista Pigna, *I Romanzi*, Vinegia, 1554, p. 14.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 15. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 42. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 9. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 25. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 65. "Et come in tutto il Duello non mai da lui veduto, lume ne diede esso Aristotele, cosi quivi ne Romanzi è stato la nostra guida, benchè egli mai non ne parlasse."

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 78. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[10] Cf. Porcacchi, *Lettere di XIII huomini illustrij*, Venetia, 1576, pp. 444 ff.

be made of many actions, giving it new rules and prescribing for it new laws with his wonderful learning and judgment."

Capriano, disagreeing with Aristotle when he gives precedence to tragedy, declares that the fact that the epic includes an action of many years does not cause it to have less unity or to be less pleasing.[1]

Minturno, in the *De Poeta*, repeats the Aristotelian precept that the epic plot should be one, complete, and perfect, and that the beginning, middle, and end should be in accord.[2] Like Robortelli and Giraldi, he uses the illustration of the organism. "Is not the human body complete and one? But its parts are head, arms, hands, legs, and feet, which by themselves are complete and one."[3] Therefore when a heroic poem is occupied with one action the plot will be one; and, because it will be protracted to a great length, it is customary for such a poem to embrace events from which many dramatic plots can be formed. Although the heroic narrative is permitted to include many things, it ought not, however, to be so prolonged that it seems overburdened, nor of such length that it cannot be completely grasped.[4] Minturno does not share the opinion of such writers as Segni, Madius, and Capriano. Although declaring that the plot will be one if the action is one, he continues saying that if a writer observe the poems of the ancients he will discover that epic actions are perfect if within the period of one year.[5]

Vettori contends that Aristotle teaches that one epic can be rightly prolonged to the same time limit that is required for the representation of a number of tragedies, "so that if the spectators remain in the theatre for the space of eight hours paying attention to many tragedies which are portrayed, to that same space of time the epic may be prolonged, for it may be supposed that men would hear with pleasure an epic poem recited for the same number of hours."[6] He admonishes epic writers, therefore, that they should not give the epic a larger body than would be that of all those tragedies which are produced in one day, for although epic poems

[1] Capriano, *Della vera poetica*, Vinegia, 1555, chap. iv.

[2] *De Poeta*, Venetiis, 1555, p. 147.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 152. [4] *Ibid.* [5] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

[6] P. Victorius (Vettori), *Commentarii in primum librum Aristotelis de arte poetarum*, Florentiae, 1560, p. 250.

were not recited in the theater in the same manner as tragedy, yet, if they were read aloud, the recitation or reading of the epic poem would consume the same amount of time as that occupied in the action of the tragic plot, an idea which was later attacked by Castelvetro. Vettori observes that when Aristotle asserts that the epic is extended to its proper length by means of episodes, he means that without episodes the epic would be insignificant, or, in other words, he wishes to signify that the length which is perceived in every epic work is contributed by the episodes and is not part of the argument; "for some ignorant person who could not distinguish episodes from the argument of the poem thought that this prolixity arose from the argument."[1] Vettori is merely corroborating the assertions of Segni, Giraldi, and others regarding the true nature and use of the episodes.

Scaliger seems to lay himself open to the criticism of Vettori as being one of the *imperiti* who fail to distinguish episodes from the argument where he says that, inasmuch as several plots can be extracted from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, they cease to be a complete organism with one plot. "Finally Aristotle laughs at those who think that either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* is a complete organism with one plot, for he says that one may draw several plots from either one, because there are many parts and many episodes. So it was that the ancients used to recite certain portions taken from the whole body, as, for instance, the battle and catalogue of the ships, the summoning of the spirits, those things which happened on Circe's island, etc."[2]

One should certainly not be overhasty in condemning Scaliger as *imperitus*, but he is unquestionably open to the criticism of failing to state his thought clearly, and of failing to define his terms. When Aristotle says that several plots can be composed from the poems of Homer he means tragic plots and not epic plots (Scaliger implies the latter meaning by his use of the word *fabulas*) and consequently Aristotle does not "laugh at those who think that the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* is a complete organism with one plot." It will be recalled that what Aristotle really said was that "the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have many parts, each one of them in itself of some magnitude; yet

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 173. [2] J. C. Scaliger, *Poetices*, MDXCIV, lib. i, cap. v.

the structure of the two Homeric poems is as perfect as can be, and the action in them as nearly as possible one action,"[1] and Aristotle recommends that they be accepted as models in so far as they are one organism with one plot. Scaliger, however, recognizes the need of unity when he subscribes to the Aristotelian idea of the organism. The author should divide his book into chapters, "all so related that they constitute an organic body."

Inasmuch as Trissino's *Arte poetica* is little more than a paraphrase of Aristotle, we find almost all the precepts of the Stagirite repeated with only slight variation. In the fifth division, appearing in 1563, for instance,[2] Trissino says that care must be taken in forming the plot, that it be one, complete, and great; and this "one" does not mean that it includes all the deeds of a single man, a matter in which many are deceived. Trissino gives as an example of this idea of unity the *Decameron* of Boccaccio, thus interpreting in its broadest significance the idea of Aristotle that the plot should be based on a single action, so as to enable the work to produce its own pleasure. It is not many actions of one man, but a unity resulting from the concerted action of many.

Minturno, in *l'Arte poetica*, contends that the *romanzi* are not the poetry which Aristotle and Horace taught.[3] There are those, he continues, who confess that the *romanzi* do not conform to the form and rule which Homer and Virgil followed, and yet obstinately defend this error, saying that because such compositions treat of the deeds of wandering knights they need not conform to Aristotelian laws but require the inclusion of diverse matters. The heroic poem imitates one memorable, perfect deed of one illustrious person; the *romanzi* have for their object the assembling of knights and ladies, and the treatment of matters of war and of peace. The *romanzi* describe diverse countries and various things which happened in all the time which the story covers. Homer, he agrees, did the same thing to a certain extent, but everything he described had its origin from one beginning and was directed to one end. This is not the case in the *romanzi*.[4] However, he contends that Ariosto could have

[1] Cf. Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 91.
[2] Cf. Trissino, *Tutte le opere*, Verona, 1729, p. 97.
[3] *L'arte poetica*, Napoli, MDCCXXV, p. 26.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

adhered to the same law of unity by treating the same subject-matter in a different way. If Ariosto was not content to treat only the affairs of Ruggiero as the most excellent of all knights, he should have composed another story devoted only to his deeds, just as Homer had done, who praised Achilles in the *Iliad* and Ulysses in the *Odyssey*. He would not then have pretended in the title that he was writing of Orlando, and then in reality have described the deeds of another as the principal character, nor would he have assembled a great mass of persons and things such that a whole poem would be required to describe some of them. Minturno does not say this to detract from the worth of Ariosto as a poet but rather to excuse him for not knowing better than to follow the abuses of the *romanzi* to please the many.[1] The writers of *romanzi* interrupt frequently the course of the poem, going from one part to another, and taking up the thread again where they left off. The interruption of the narrative, contends Minturno, interferes with the enjoyment of the reader; the interest is aroused by many incidents contributing to the same end.

As a perfect and well-formed animal causes delight, so is the plot sufficiently complete which can cause pleasure to the minds of others.[2] It is manifest that Virgil and Homer have undertaken to treat a complete and perfect matter concerning things which happened only within a year. Homer treats in the *Iliad* that which happened in the tenth year of the Trojan War; in the *Odyssey*, the return of Ulysses to Ithaca. These authors treat many things which are not part of the plot, but parts outside of it; it is necessary, however, that they be so connected that, although they can be separated from it without detriment to it, nevertheless they should appear to be derived from it and to be directed to the same end.[3] "But, although it has this prerogative of being able to increase its length so much, the subject-matter of the plot cannot deal with things which happened in a longer space than a year."[4]

For Castelvetro the dramatic unity of action is only a consequence of the unities of time and place, and hence subordinate to them; and since, as we shall see later, he is not inclined to restrict

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 29.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

the epic as to time and place, so the Aristotelian unity of action is of relatively little importance to him. He has, in fact, a very broad and inclusive idea of the unity of action as applied to the epic. He repeats the Aristotelian precept that the plot should be one and contain a single action of one person, but he follows this statement with the assertion that the epic plot can relate not only one but many actions.[1] The epic, then, can have a great number of actions. The question to be determined, consequently, is the meaning which Castelvetro gives to the word "action." Is he here making "action" synonymous with "plot" as he does elsewhere,[2] or is he speaking literally of the deeds of the personages which will be included in one plot, as he does in another passage?[3] The latter interpretation seems to accord more with the general statement of his principles. He contends, for example, that there are numerous ways of uniting many different actions and of making them become one action and one body, as for instance, the method of adhering to a limited time or place, reputing many actions one because they happen at the same time or in the same place.[4] The mere fact that the actions occur at the same time, however, is not sufficient, for coincidence of actions does not necessarily entail any interrelationship of events. Those epic poets err who write of actions which happened at one time to one person or more, when there is no interdependence in the happenings.[5] One can be reasonably sure, then, that when Castelvetro joins the words "plot" and "action" he means the main action, just as we speak of it, and elsewhere he desires to signify the deeds of the personages.

He repeats the idea already expressed by Robortelli, Giraldi, and Vettori, that beginning, middle, and end can first be considered in a large whole, and can then be considered in some part of that whole, as if that part were another whole somewhat smaller.[6] The

[1] Castelvetro, *Poetica d'Aristotele*, Basilea, MDLXXVI, p. 179.

[2] "Ma ci dobbiamo ricordare . . . . che non si può far tragedia che sia lodevole, la quale non habbia due attioni, ciò è, due favole, quantunque l'una sia principale, l'altra accessoria" (p. 692); and again, "Se le cose imaginate sono più, le imagini debbano essere più, e per conseguente, che la favola, la quale è imagine dell'attione, sia uno, o più, secondo che l'attione è uno, o più."

[3] "Non ha dubbio niuno, che, se nell' historia si narra sotto un raccontamento più attioni d'una persona sola . . . . nella poesia si potrà sotto una favola narrare senza biasimo più attioni d'una persona sola." Cf. p. 178.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 181. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 507. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 511.

Trojan War, which lasted ten years, would be considered a perfect action, and the wrath of Achilles, which is a part of the aforesaid war, considered by itself, would be regarded as another perfect action. The explanation of the matter lies in the fact that for Castelvetro the unity of action is not the result of any necessity but is merely the effect of the desire on the part of the author to show greater excellence.[1] He contends that Homer did not adopt the unity of action as a result of the restriction in time and place, but that the real reason for the adherence to such a unity was that Homer considered the singularity of action more beautiful.[2] Castelvetro declares, and with more than mild disapproval, that Aristotle can adduce no other reason or proof than the example of the tragic poets and of Homer for this singularity of action. Such examples, apparently, are not convincing to Castelvetro. What is more, he proceeds to expound his theories of this broader unity of action in direct opposition to the teaching of Aristotle. He opposes absolutely the views of the Stagirite. "If we believe the words of Aristotle"—and there is a strong implication that Castelvetro does not—"we should have to blame Vida who composed the *Cristiade*, in which are related many miraculous actions of Christ, because like those poets blamed by Aristotle he narrated many actions of one person. And furthermore (that is, if we believe the words of Aristotle), we should not be able to commend as a well-constructed plot that of the *Iliad* of Homer, for, although it contains a single action (or rather a part of an action, according to Aristotle, that is, a part of the Trojan War) it is not an action of a single person but of a people, because that war was made by common consent of the chiefs of the Greeks." "And so much the less should we be able to consider" (that is, if we believe the words of Aristotle) as a well-constructed plot that which not only contains many actions of one person, or one action of many persons, but also many actions of many persons."[3] All this Castelvetro considers not only possible but proper to include in the epic plot. He sees in the practice and method of historians the example and justification of a similar procedure by the poets, inasmuch as for him poetry is an imitation of history—*rassomiglianza d'historia*. If in history, he maintans,[4]

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 179 and 504. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 179. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 178. [4] *Ibid.*

one can narrate many actions of a single person, as Plutarch, Suetonius, and others have done, there is no doubt that one can narrate in poetry a single action of a whole people. After thus enlarging the number of the personages to include a whole nation engaged in one action, it is but a step for Castelvetro to justify the inclusion of the many actions of a people such as those treated by Livy and other historians. And if one concede as permissible many actions of one people, it is readily recognized that many actions of many people can be admitted into the narration of the heroic poem.[1] Such, then, is the latitude with which Castelvetro treats the unity of action.

But just as we shall see in his treatment of the unities of time and place, Castelvetro the radical becomes Castelvetro the conservative by the added assertion that, after all, the poet displays in a marked manner his judgment and industry when he treats a plot comprising but a single action of a single person (a plot, that is, which at first sight would not appear capable of causing pleasure to the hearers) in such a way that he causes the readers as much delight as other poets can scarcely cause with many actions of many persons.[2] And although he would permit unusual freedom in the unity of action, his basic belief is summarized in the words already cited: "The epic ought to comprise one action of one person, not from necessity, but for a demonstration of the excellence of the poet."[3] It will be seen that he admits into the legitimate domain of the epic the *romanzi* of which Giraldi, Pigna, and Minturno had constituted a genre apart, although he did not entirely countenance the "improper digressions" in the *Orlando Furioso*.[4]

Castelvetro deduced the dramatic unities of time and place from the practice and the theory of the tragedy, and their application to the epic is of secondary importance to him. Just as we have seen that he treats in a broad way the unity of action, so does he assert, regarding the unity of time, that the time of the action of the epic is not determined, because the epic, narrating with words alone, can relate an action which happened during the course of many years and in diverse places, since the words may present to our minds

[1] Castelvetro, *op. cit.*, p. 179. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

things distant in time and place.[1] The epic, then, not having to conform to the restricted limits of time and place, like tragedy, can relate an action which happened in many years, not in many days only, and in places far distant, not in one place only.

Castelvetro does not agree with the commentators such as Vettori, who believe, first, that Aristotle meant that the reading or recitation (*constitutione*) of the epic should last as long as the presentation of several tragedies, which are recited one after another in one day; and secondly, that the epic should not be so long that it cannot be read in a day. Although Aristotle had placed the discussion of the length of the presentation of tragedy outside the theory of poetry, Castelvetro includes the question in his treatise, and, identifying the time of the presentation with the time of the action of the tragedy, disagrees with the first rule regarding the epic, because many tragedies naturally ought not to be capable of being recited in one day, one after another, according to his idea, for each tragedy has its limits conformable to one turn of the sun. How then, he asks, if each tragedy occupies a whole day, can several be recited in one day, one after the other?

Regarding the second rule, Castelvetro asks: "If the epic ought not to exceed one day in reading, according to Aristotle, where would be the divinity of Homer (who is so much admired by him), who has made two epic poems, neither of which could be read even in a few days"?[2] Regarding these two points Castelvetro denies, then, that the length of the epic should be equal to the number of tragedies read in a day, and that the length of the epic is in reality restricted to one day. He ascribes to the poem a length conformable to the natural needs of the audience, and concludes that the epic cannot be extended to such a length that it would be unreasonable to recite it to the people at one time, that is, in as many hours as the people could listen in comfort. Therefore the long epics are divided into such lengths as are *verisimile*, so that the author may comfortably recite and the auditors listen to him at a single time.

Castelvetro cannot believe that Homer would have committed such an error as to continue twenty-four books without any division,

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 532.

reciting all of them at one time. The epic can divide its narration into many books, which nevertheless do not contain more than one action, and can recite one book per day without occasioning any great difficulty in following the story.[1] Despite this great freedom in the unity of time, concludes Castelvetro (and this statement is significant), the more the time of the action in the epic will be restricted, the more praiseworthy it will be. The same is true of the unity of place. The epic is not limited as regards place, for its action can take place in heaven or hell, on land or sea, or in the air. "Nevertheless, in the epic also, the more the place is restricted, the more it is commendable and the more does the epic succeed."[2]

But Castelvetro, in spite of the singular breadth of vision which we have noted, does not entirely escape from the tendency of the typical sixteenth-century critic to impose rigorous restrictions on the forms of literature. While apparently allowing extreme liberty, he qualifies his assertions. The unity of action is not imperative, but the poet who desires to show his excellence will strive for it; the unity of time is not necessary, yet the more the time of the action in the epic is restricted, the more praiseworthy it will be. There are no limits regarding the place in which the epic action may occur, yet the more limited the place, the more is the poem to be commended.

RALPH C. WILLIAMS

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

[1] Castelvetro, *op. cit.*, p. 110. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 535.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *December 1920* NUMBER 8

A PLAUTINE SOURCE OF *THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR*

I

Up to the present time the sources of much of the plot of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* have been untraced. In regard to these portions of the play Neilson's summary expresses the opinion of Shakespeare scholars: "The initial betrayal of Falstaff by Pistol and Nym, the disguise as Mother Prat, the pinching by the fairies, the underplot of the triple wooing of Anne Page, and all the characters save the commonplace of the jealous husband, seem to be original."[1]

In fact, however, ever since Shakespeare's day a source for all these elements of *The Merry Wives*, except the fairies' part of the play (and a suggestion for that exists therein), has been readily accessible to scholars, but it has been hitherto unnoticed. This source is the comedy of *Casina* by Plautus. That this drama served as a direct source for all that part of *The Merry Wives* not founded upon either *The Two Lovers of Pisa* or *Philenio*[2] the writer hopes to show in the following pages.

II

Before the question of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Plautus is taken up, it seems best to review the existing theories as to the originals of *The Merry Wives*. The first suggestion concerning a

[1] *Cambridge Shakespeare*, p. 152.

[2] These sources are later considered and their contribution to Shakespeare's comedy defined.

source for the comedy occurs in Langbaine's *Dramatic Poets.*[1] There Langbaine calls attention to the resemblance in plot of the Shakespearian play to *Lucius and Camillus*, a novel in *The Fortunate, Deceived, and Unfortunate Lovers.*[2] He says that, although the stories in the collection were written since Shakespeare's time (the book was published in 1632), yet they are translations from the novels of Cinthio and Malespini, thus leading the reader to infer that Shakespeare, in Langbaine's opinion, had perhaps utilized an original Italian story. Unfortunately, the tale is not to be found in Cinthio, and Malespini's collection was not published until 1609, so that such an inference would be decidedly wrong.

Steevens[3] gives as possible sources tales from *Il Pecorone*[4] of Ser Giovanni Fiorentino and from the *Piacevoli Notti*[5] of Straparola. As quoted by Malone,[6] Farmer advances *The Two Lovers of Pisa*, a novel in *Tarleton's News out of Purgatory*, as a source. Malone himself believed that the Windsor setting of the comedy was suggested to its author by *The Fishwife's Tale of Brentford* in *Westward for Smelts* and that the plot came from a combination of *The Two Lovers* and *Lucius and Camillus.*[7] Another tale from Straparola, that of *Filenio*,[8] has also been cited as a source.[9] This story was translated by Painter and appears as Novel 49, Tome I, of *The Palace of Pleasure.*[10] It is there entitled *Philenio Sisterna.*

These various tales have all been taken to refer to the plot of the merry wives against Falstaff. In the story of *Filenio* and in the English version, *Philenio*, we find the lover paying his addresses simultaneously to three ladies who confide in each other and combine to revenge themselves upon him for his triplicity, so to speak.

[1] Ed. 1691, pp. 459–60. Gildon in his garbling of Langbaine omits any mention of *The Merry Wives.*

[2] Novel I. Reprinted by Hazlitt, *Shakespeare's Library*, III, 33 ff.

[3] Quoted by Malone, *Variorum Shakespeare*, VIII, 3.

[4] Day I, Novel 2. [5] Night IV, Fable 4. [6] *Loc. cit.*

[7] *Variorum Shakespeare*, VIII, 210.

[8] Night II, Fable 2.

[9] See, for example, Neilson, *op. cit.*, p. 152, or Hazlitt, *Shakespeare's Library*, Vol. III, where the tale is reprinted.

[10] Miss Porter and Miss Clark, in their First Folio edition of *The Merry Wives*, claim to be the first to point out that Painter translated Straparola's novel. W. G. Waters, however, in the notes to his translation of the *Notti* for the Society of Bibliophiles, London, 1898, mentions Painter's translation of *Filenio* (IV, 283).

Straparola in *Nerino of Portugal*—merely translated in the *News*—relates how a young man who is enamored of a lady unwittingly keeps her husband informed of the progress of his suit to her and how the husband seeks to take the two *in flagrante delicto*. To escape capture by the jealous husband Nerino hides successively in three places from his pursuers and so evades punishment. The novel of *Bucciuolo* by Ser Giovanni and its English translation, *Lucius and Camillus*, are similar to *Nerino* in their general outlines. The sole resemblance[1] of *The Fishwife's Tale* has been noted above.

Of these stories five may be eliminated as probable sources for *The Merry Wives*. *The Fishwife's Tale*[2] and *Lucius and Camillus* appeared first respectively in 1620 and 1632;[3] hence they are out of the question as sources for the play. Ser Giovanni's novel (the original of *Lucius and Camillus*) has been set aside by some scholars because of their doubt as to Shakespeare's knowledge of Italian.[4] For the same reason the *Nerino* and the *Filenio* of Straparola would have to be passed over as sources. However, in regard to the three novels just mentioned a better cause than Shakespeare's problematical lack of knowledge of Italian exists for their rejection as probable originals for *The Merry Wives*. Both *Bucciuolo* and *Nerino* closely approach in their plots *The Two Lovers of Pisa;* indeed that tale is a mere translation of *Nerino*. Therefore, the English novel may as well be a source as either of the Italian narratives. Besides, when an English version was available, one, moreover, contained in such a work as *Tarleton's News*, which traded upon the popularity of a famous comedian, and which was hence surely known to Shakespeare, it seems absurd to suppose that the

[1] Unless we find a very general and equally vague resemblance in the fact that both the play and the tale have to do with jealous husbands.

[2] However, Lee, *Life of William Shakespeare*, p. 247, gives, with *The Two Lovers*, Ser Giovanni's novel and *The Fishwife's Tale* as sources for Shakespeare's play.

[3] Lee, *ibid.*, quotes Malone and Steevens as saying that there was an edition of *Westward for Smelts* in 1603. As *The Merry Wives* was printed in 1602 and perhaps was first acted three or four years earlier, the situation is not altered. Malone, *Variorum Shakespeare*, VIII, 210, conjectures that the tales in *The Fortunate . . . . Lovers* had appeared in English by Shakespeare's time. There is no evidence, however, of any edition of this work earlier than that of 1632.

[4] See Neilson, *op. cit.* The writer does not subscribe to the idea of Shakespeare's ignorance of Italian, for he knows of no good grounds on which to found such a belief.

dramatist resorted to an Italian original.[1] For the same reason one appears justified in considering that Shakespeare used Painter's translation of *Filenio* as found in *The Palace of Pleasure* and not the text of Straparola. It would seem then that *The Two Lovers of Pisa* (an English translation from the Italian published about 1590) and *Philenio Sisterna* (a translation also from the Italian dating from 1566) are the sources of *The Merry Wives* now usually recognized.[2]

A comparison, however, of *The Two Lovers* and the play shows that but part of the plot of the latter can be founded upon the novel. Nor, indeed, would the indebtedness really be any greater with any of the other versions of the same story named above.[3] *The Two Lovers of Pisa* resembles in nothing but its barest outlines a portion of the plot of *The Merry Wives;*[4] and the inclusion of *Philenio* as a source accounts for only one additional element in the play and that a minor one. To supply the hitherto unknown source for these apparently original portions of *The Merry Wives* is, then, the writer's task, and, as he has said, he believes that he has discovered that source in the *Casina* of Plautus.

III

The most obvious resemblance of *The Merry Wives* to *Casina* is in the subplot of the former, that is to say, in the part of the Shakespearian play which deals with the wooing of Anne Page. Here Dr. Caius and Slender are suitors for the hand of Anne. Caius is favored by the mother, Slender by the father. Anne, however,

[1] Hazlitt seems to have been of the opinion that Shakespeare used *The Two Lovers* as a source for *The Merry Wives* rather than any other novel. He points out specific resemblances between the story and the play in his *Shakespeare's Library*, III, 66, note; 67, note; 69, note; 72, note.

[2] See Neilson, *op. cit.*, p. 152; Hart, *The Merry Wives* (Arden ed.), Introduction, p. lxxxi. Fleay's claim, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, II, 161, that the plot of *Wily Beguiled* "is identical with the Anne Page story" is rashly made. There is a very vague resemblance but nothing more.

[3] In *Bucciuolo* and in *Lucius and Camillus* the lover, upon the occasion of his first surprise by the husband, is hidden by his mistress under a pile of half-dry linen. Upon the next visit of the lover he is hidden elsewhere, and the unlucky husband searches the pile of clothing. There is no basket and the clothes are not dirty, as in *The Merry Wives*. In *The Two Lovers* Lionello is hidden in "a great driefatte full of feathers." Cf. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare's Library*, III, 66, note.

[4] The most important differences between the novel and the play are pointed out later.

dislikes both these lovers, and herself prefers Fenton, a man of higher birth than either she or they. Each of the two parents intends to carry through a plot unknown to the other whereby Anne would be stolen away from a masquerade (the culmination of the trick on Falstaff) and wedded to one of the favored suitors. Both Caius and Slender run away with persons dressed as they have been told Anne would be clad, but return in great disgust, for in each case the supposed girl has turned out to be a boy in disguise. The imposture is discovered by each after the marriage ceremony has been performed. Then Fenton and Anne enter, and, disclosing that they have eloped and have been married, receive the parental blessing.

In *Casina*, Euthynicus is in love with the slave Casina. Lysidamus, his father, who also is enamored of her, purposes to marry her to Olympio, his bailiff. Cleustrata, mother to Euthynicus and wife to Lysidamus, suspecting her husband's passion for the girl, favors her marriage to Chalinus, armor-bearer to Euthynicus. It seems understood that the newly wed husband (whether he is Olympio or Chalinus) shall act with suitable complacency toward his own master (Lysidamus or Euthynicus). After much squabbling between the two parties lots are drawn to determine which candidate shall wed Casina. Olympio wins and he and his master prepare for the wedding. After the feast Olympio is to pretend to start with his bride for Lysidamus' villa, but is in reality to repair with her to the home of a neighbor, Alcesimus, where his place is to be taken by his master. Discovering this plan through the means of Chalinus, Cleustrata disguises Chalinus as Casina, and he sets out with Olympio. Cleustrata, Myrrhina, her friend and wife to Alcesimus, and Pardalisca, a slave, watch outside the home of Alcesimus after the bridal couple accompanied by Lysidamus have entered it. First, Olympio reappears. After the bailiff has soliloquized upon the beating administered to him by the false bride and has related the particulars to Cleustrata, Lysidamus enters in great trepidation and confusion. Chalinus follows shortly in his feminine costume and confronts the two, who apparently have become aware of the supposed bride's sex and identity (the play is very defective near the end). Lysidamus asks his wife to forgive him; this she does and the two are reconciled. The epilogue states that Casina

will be discovered to be a free woman, the daughter of Alcesimus, and that thereupon she will be married to Euthynicus.

We find in both plays, then, the man and wife urging the claims of their respective candidates for the hand of a young girl (in *Casina* a slave, not a daughter). The maiden is in love with a third person —the son of the house in Plautus. A mock wedding occurs in which the bride's part is taken by a male, and from which results the discomfiture of the bridegroom (two of these ceremonies take place in *The Merry Wives*). Finally, the true lovers are united. Furthermore, the mother in both plays is assisted by a friend and by a female servant.

IV

In other respects the stories of the two plays resemble each other, and this likeness extends into the main plot of *The Merry Wives*. In the same manner as Cleustrata and Myrrhina conspire in *Casina* to bring Lysidamus to shame, Mrs. Page and Mrs. Ford in Shakespeare's comedy devise ways to expose the credulous amorousness of Falstaff to the general ridicule.[1]

It should be noted, also, that the merry wives make three attempts to break Falstaff of his passion for Mrs. Ford. Cleustrata in *Casina* tries three times after the lot-drawing (the beginning of Lysidamus' plot) to divert her husband from his pursuit of Casina. First, she attempts to embroil him with Alcesimus, whose house is necessary to the plan (III, i, ii, iv); next, she instigates Pardalisca's story to Lysidamus of Casina's madness in the hope of frightening him away from the girl (III, v); finally, she exposes him by means of the false Casina (V). In both plays the first two tricks are unsuccessful; the last stratagems, in each play the most elaborate, are successful. The final disgrace of both Falstaff and Lysidamus takes place before more of the dramatis personae than do the earlier attempted tricks; that is, they are more public.

Myrrhina—somewhat too philosophically perhaps—affects no jealousy of her husband Alcesimus. Likewise, Page expresses his

[1] In *Philenio* the three offended ladies do not publicly make Philenio a laughing-stock; in fact his revenge in turn upon them is more in spirit like the merry wives' trick upon Falstaff. Also each of the three ladies in the story plays a trick upon Philenio. That person, besides, is a young man, whereas Falstaff is advanced in years.

faith in his wife and refuses to believe that she would listen to Falstaff's lovemaking (II, i, 142 ff.). Just as Chalinus is privy to Cleustrata's devices against her husband and Olympio, so does Robin, Falstaff's page lent by him to Mrs. Page, undoubtedly understand what the two women are projecting against his master.

In Plautus' comedy, Chalinus, overhearing the plans of Lysidamus and Olympio, betrays them to Cleustrata, who sets in motion her counterplot for humiliating the conspirators. So Pistol and Nym, to thwart Falstaff's proposed seduction of Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Page, inform Ford and Page of their late patron's intention. Furthermore, as the old satyr Lysidamus is the butt of *Casina*, so is Falstaff the "vlouting stog" of *The Merry Wives*. The supposedly fortunate suitor of Casina, likewise, comes to grief, just as do the favored Caius and Slender in Shakespeare's play.

V

The scene of *Casina* is removed by Shakespeare from Greece to the Windsor of Henry IV's reign, and the Grecian citizens and slaves are transformed into a group of burgesses, country gentlemen, courtiers, and their hangers-on. Aside from its being mingled with the matter of at least one Elizabethan tale (or two, if the *Philenio* is counted), many other changes have been made in *Casina*, both in the action and in the characters.

In *The Merry Wives* the plot is built around two points: one, the jealousy of Ford, the other, the wooing of Anne Page. In *Casina*, however, the two are combined, and the hoodwinking of the old debauchee goes with the mock marriage. Jealousy is present in the Plautine comedy, but it is interwoven with the courtship motive. Cleustrata is jealous of her disreputable old husband Lysidamus and is nagging at him constantly. Shakespeare has turned the tables and has set a jealous husband to watching his wife. One should remember, also, that the disguise of Chalinus as the bride Casina deceives two persons, the husband Olympio and Lysidamus, while in *The Merry Wives* there are two bogus brides for the two deceived wooers. Plautus gives us no love scenes between Euthynicus and Casina; indeed, neither appears during the course of the action. Shakespeare, however, not only shows his young

lovers together, but brings them on the stage married at the conclusion of the play.

Rowe recorded[1] the tradition that Queen Elizabeth, having been highly pleased with Falstaff in *Henry IV*, commanded Shakespeare to write a play showing the knight in love. *The Merry Wives*, Rowe tells us, was the result. This story gains in credibility when we consider how *The Two Lovers* is altered. The aged Falstaff is made its hero instead of the young Lionello. The necessity of bringing Falstaff in as the would-be seducer—since he could hardly figure as the husband—accounts for this change in character. No doubt, too, the influence of Lysidamus in *Casina* contributes somewhat to this alteration.

VI

The plot of the Plautine play is considerably changed in minor points in order to admit Falstaff into it. In *Casina*, Lysidamus, the prototype of Page, is old, cowardly, debauched, credulous, vain, and perseveringly amorous. Naturally enough these traits go to Falstaff, who had them with certain saving graces already indeed in *Henry IV*. Earlier critics have derived Falstaff from various classical originals—from the boasting soldier, as Pyrgopolinices in *Miles Gloriosus*,[2] or from the parasite, as Ergasilus in *Captivi*. However, a figure in Latin comedy which resembles Falstaff closely has hitherto been overlooked. This is that of the licentious old man, such as is Antipho in *Stichus* or especially Lysidamus in *Casina*. In fact it seems probable that the likeness of Lysidamus to Falstaff first suggested to Shakespeare the use of *Casina* as a source for *The Merry Wives*. Lysidamus is in love, it should be remembered. If we put credence in Rowe's tradition, which is mentioned above, we see here another reason why this particular Latin play would have appealed to Shakespeare as a source.

Lee says in his *Life of Shakespeare*[3] of the chief character of *The Merry Wives:* "Although Falstaff is the central figure, he is a mere caricature of his former self. His power of retort has decayed, and

[1] In his "Account" of Shakespeare's life, *Works* (ed. 1709), I, viii–ix.

[2] For example, see J. Thümmel's article, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XIII, 1–12, and particularly Reinhardstoettner, *Plautus*, pp. 671 ff.

[3] See p. 152.

the laugh invariably turns against him. In name only is he identical with the potent humorist of 'Henry IV.'" With this opinion all readers of the play are in agreement. Why then should the Falstaff of *The Merry Wives* be no longer the Falstaff of *Henry IV?* The answer is that he is influenced by the Lysidamus of *Casina*. From the ready and resourceful old rascal of the historical plays he has become a gull—easily hoodwinked and falling into trap after trap, exactly the same kind of character as Lysidamus. In explanation of this fact it may be said by some critics that the unfortunate, but later successful, lover of *The Two Lovers* is transformed into the same figure. This is of course true, but Falstaff and Lionello both have been made over upon the model of the Lysidamus of Plautus.

The variations in *The Merry Wives* from the plots of the novels will be given below to show how far Shakespeare was from a blind following of *The Two Lovers* or of *Philenio* and how he adapted them as he did *Casina*.

In *The Two Lovers* the jealous husband Mutio is a very old man ("his age about fourscore") and his wife Margaret is young. Her lover Lionello is "a young Gentleman," who is attracted to her by her beauty, not by her husband's wealth. Their affection is genuine and mutual. Lionello confides his passion for Margaret to her husband "for that hee was olde and knewe much, and was a Physition that with his drugges might helpe him forward in his purposes," and requests Mutio's aid in his suit to the lady, ignorant of course that she is the old doctor's wife. Thrice does Mutio surprise the two together; once Lionello escapes by hiding in a hamper filled with feathers, the next time by concealing himself in a nook between the floors, and the third time by being shut up in a chest of papers which is carried out from Mutio's country house when it has been fired by the jealous old man. Lionello does not suspect that his mistress and Mutio are man and wife until, as he is telling the story of his amours to Mutio and his brothers-in-law, he is warned of the facts in the case by Margaret's sending him a cup of wine with a ring in it which he has given her. He then turns the matter off by alleging that his stories to Mutio have been false and that he has told them to play upon the physician's jealousy. After this Mutio is mocked until he dies of chagrin; the lovers are then married.

In *Philenio* the hero makes love to three women, who learn from each other of his courtship of them and plan accordingly to revenge the slight upon him. They separately arrange assignations with Philenio in the course of which he is badly mishandled. Learning how the ladies have duped him, he in turn revenges himself upon them. In the Shakespearian play there are but two ladies and Falstaff makes no effort to avenge himself upon them for their treatment of him. The sole resemblances are in the making love to more than one woman, their finding out this fact, and paying the lover off for his indiscretion.

The couple who are attempting to direct a marriage in Shakespeare's comedy have no other point of disagreement than that which arises from the marrying of their daughter. That is to say, Shakespeare has taken the Lysidamus and Cleustrata of Plautus, has reversed their jealousy, making it unfounded incidentally, and has given it to his Ford and Mrs. Ford. The sole attribute of Lysidamus and Cleustrata preserved by Page and his wife is their conflict over Anne's suitors (in Plautus over those of Casina). On the other hand, their friends, the Fords, have the jealousy of Cleustrata and the intriguing of Lysidamus with the important difference that the husband is the jealous person and that his wife has no intention of being unfaithful to him. In other respects the Fords correspond to Alcesimus and Myrrhina, neighbors and friends of Lysidamus and Cleustrata.

Shakespeare's Shallow was probably introduced into the play because a second foolish old man seemed necessary to act as a foil to Falstaff, as Alcesimus in *Casina* sets off Lysidamus. The slave Casina is changed by Shakespeare into Page's daughter Anne, an heiress. It is important to note here again that in the Plautine epilogue Casina is stated to be the long-lost daughter of Alcesimus, and hence a free woman. If we consider that Shakespeare effected this alteration in the degree of his heroine before the opening of his comedy, instead of after its conclusion, the resemblance of the character is still more striking.

The two candidates for the hand of Casina—Olympio and Chalinus—Shakespeare has transformed, respectively, into Slender, Page's preference as a son-in-law, and Doctor Caius, Mrs. Page's

choice. Shakespeare's Pistol and Nym, who revenge themselves upon Falstaff by revealing his projects to Page and Ford, play a portion of the part of Plautus' Chalinus, who betrays to his mistress his master's plans in regard to Casina. The mutes who are stolen away from the fairy dance in Windsor Forest by Slender and Caius exercise the function of Chalinus as a bride. Dame Quickly is a Shakespearian version of the mischievous Pardalisca, maid to Cleustrata. Finally, it is not impossible that the Host of the Garter is expanded from the Plautine cook, Chytrio.

These redistributions of traits and remodelings of characters, which may seem complicated but which are not in fact difficult to follow, can best be summarized in tabular form:

Casina	*The Merry Wives*
Lysidamus	Sir John Falstaff
Lysidamus	George Page
Alcesimus	Ford
Alcesimus	Robert Shallow
Euthynicus	Fenton
Euthynicus	William Page
Olympio	Abraham Slender
Chalinus	Doctor Caius
Chalinus	Pistol
Chalinus	Nym
Chalinus	Fairies in green and white
Chytrio	Host of the Garter
Myrrhina	Mrs. Ford
Cleustrata	Mrs. Page
Casina	Anne Page
Pardalisca	Mrs. Quickly

All the characters of Plautus are therefore, at least, paralleled in some form or other by Shakespeare. Only Sir Hugh, Bardolph, Robin, Simple, and Rugby are obtained from sources other than *Casina* or the *novelle*. Of these Bardolph[1] and the page occur in *Henry IV*,

[1] It is not impossible that Shakespeare's choice of the name Bardolph as a designation for Falstaff's red-nosed follower was a jest directed at a friend and colleague. In *Shakespeare's England*, II, 82–83, Oswald Barron quotes from a pamphlet, *A brief Discourse of the causes of Discord amongst the officers of arms and of the great abuses and absurdities comitted by painters to the great prejudice and hindrance of the same office*, the author of which was William Smith, Rouge Dragon Pursuivant: "Phillipps the player had graven in a gold ring the arms of Sir William Phillipp, Lord Bardolph, with the said L. Bardolph's cote quartred. . . . ." This pamphlet dates from 1599. There seems a

Part II, as does Shallow, who takes over some of Alcesimus' functions. Sir Hugh, Simple, and Rugby are not found in any other Shakespearian play, nor is there a hint in *Casina* for any one of them, unless it be that Sir Hugh's part was suggested by the fight between Olympio and Chalinus in II, vi.

VII

In the pages which follow, the relationship of *The Merry Wives* to *Casina* will be shown in detail. The various passages in Shakespeare's play which seem founded upon Plautus' comedy will be taken up in order.[1]

First,[2] Falstaff's belief that the wives of Page and Ford look upon him with favor, as expressed in I, iii, 48 ff., is derived from *Casina* (II, iii, 226–27). Here, after telling how he employs perfumes to make himself agreeable to Casina, Lysidamus says,

. . . . Et placeo, ut videor.

So Falstaff says of Mrs. Ford,

. . . . She gives the leer of invitation. I can construe the action of her familiar style; and the hardest voice of her behaviour, to be English'd rightly, is "I am Sir John Falstaff's."

The agreement of Pistol and Nym that they shall revenge themselves upon Sir John for his casting them off by informing Ford and Page of the knight's contemplated suits to their respective wives (I, iii, 99 ff.), seems suggested by the soliloquies and eavesdropping of Chalinus (*Casina*, II, vii, viii; III, ii). In the first scene cited, Chalinus, depressed by the victory of Olympio in the lot-drawing

---

chance that the dramatist, by way of poking fun at Augustine Phillips' pretensions of descent from the Lord Bardolph of Agincourt, supplied the actor with a Bardolph of that period—specially invented—from whom he might, according to the facetious Shakespeare, be descended. Such might be the explanation of the Bardolph and Lord Bardolph of *Henry IV*, Part II. Surely it is possible that if in *The Merry Wives* the poet ridicules the family of Lucy he would not hesitate to laugh at a brother-actor.

[1] References are to the second edition of Lindsay's *Plautus* in the Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis and to Neilson's *Shakespeare* in the Cambridge Poets Series.

[2] Possibly Shakespeare in *The Merry Wives*, I, i, 10–11, meant to pun upon the Latin and English meanings of "armiger." To the Roman the word denoted "armor-bearer," a kind of servant; to the Englishman, "arms-bearer," or gentleman. Slender calls Shallow "armigero," and in *Casina*, II, iii, 257, occur the words, "armigero nili atque inproba" ("to the armor-bearer, worthless and base"). It should be noted that here we find the dative case of the word, the same form which Slender improperly uses.

of II, vi, expresses his disappointment. When Lysidamus and Olympio enter (II, viii), Chalinus, eager for revenge, conceals himself in such a way as to overhear their conversation. The master and his bailiff discuss their plans, and Lysidamus explains his project of Olympio's taking Casina to the house of Alcesimus, where he has arranged that the occupants shall be out of the way. Understanding now fully the grounds for Lysidamus' persistence in backing Olympio's suit and anxious for vengeance upon his rival, Chalinus hurries from the stage to reveal to his mistress what he has learned. This revelation of the perfidy of Lysidamus takes place off stage (Pistol and Nym betray Falstaff to Page and Ford before they enter [*The Merry Wives*, II, i]), but occurs by the time of Cleustrata's entrance at the opening of III, ii. Her jealousy before this time, it should be noticed, has been based upon suspicion, rather than upon actual knowledge. It may be well to call attention here to the fact that Ford is much disturbed over Pistol's tidings as likewise is Cleustrata over those of Chalinus, which she has just heard when she comes in at the opening of III, ii.

The next evidence of indebtedness to *Casina* in *The Merry Wives* appears in II, i. The scene in both plays is in the street. Mrs. Page enters and reads Falstaff's letter to herself. While she is indignantly vowing revenge, Mrs. Ford comes in. The two compare the letters which they have received from Falstaff. They then resolve to trick him. In *Casina*, II, ii, Cleustrata and Myrrhina meet as each is going to the other's house, the former intending to confide her troubles to her friend. Parts of their dialogue are taken over literally by Shakespeare. This is shown below.

Mrs. Ford: Mistress Page! trust me, I was going to your house.

Mrs. Page: And, trust me, I was coming to you. You look very ill [ll. 33 ff.].

Then Mrs. Page repeatedly asks the cause of her friend's trouble, until Mrs. Ford tells her of Falstaff's letter. Upon meeting Cleustrata, Myrrhina says (*Casina*, II, ii, 172 ff.),

Sed quid tu es tristis, amabo?

to which Cleustrata replies that her sadness is owing to her husband's follies and adds,

Nam ego ibam ad te.

Myrrhina responds,

> Et pol ego isto ad te.

She continues,

> Sed quid est quod tuo nunc animo aegrest?
> Nam quod tibi est aegre, idem mist diuidiae.

It is only after some further persuasion, however, that she induces Cleustrata to share her troubles.

The comments of Mrs. Page (ll. 20–31) and of Mrs. Ford (ll. 64 ff., 101 ff.) upon their missives and their vows of revenge are founded upon Cleustrata's expression of her opinion of the character of her husband, Lysidamus, and her threats of starving and insulting him. In connection with this, it should be noted that Mrs. Ford suggests that the best way to punish Falstaff is "to entertain him with hope, till the wicked fire of lust have melted him in his own grease." Thus, Mrs. Ford, like Cleustrata, seeks vengeance upon her tormentor.[1]

This dialogue of Cleustrata and Myrrhina breaks off at the approach of Lysidamus. Myrrhina leaves the stage while Cleustrata steps aside. Likewise, the merry wives are interrupted by the entrance of their husbands, who are accompanied by Pistol and Nym. Both women then retire to the rear of the stage. The passage in *The Merry Wives*, II, i, 106–12, runs thus:

> *Mrs. Page:* Why, look where he comes [Ford]; and my good man too. He's as far from jealousy as I am from giving him cause; and that I hope is an unmeasurable distance.
>
> *Mrs. Ford:* You are the happier woman.
>
> *Mrs. Page:* Let's consult together against this greasy knight. Come hither.

In *Casina* (II, ii, 213–16) occurs this bit of dialogue:

> *Cl.:* st! tace.
> *My.:* quid est?
> *Cl.:* em!
> *My.:* quis est, quem vides?
> *Cl.:* uir eccum it. intro abi, adpropera, age amabo.
> *My.:* impetras, abeo.

[1] Here seems to be a borrowing from *Philenio*. The meeting of the three loves of Philenio and their exchanging confidences through which they learn of Philenio's addresses to each seems the source. For the three tricks upon Falstaff later on in *The Merry Wives* a hint, and little else, appears to have come from *Philenio*.

Cl.: mox magis quom otium et mihi et tibi erit, igitur tecum loquar, nunc vale.

My.: valeas.

Mrs. Page's "Look where he comes" is a nearly literal translation of Cleustrata's "uir eccum it."

Casina, II, iii, is a scene between Cleustrata and the newly arrived Lysidamus in which a quarrel arises, the beginning of which has been utilized by Shakespeare in *The Merry Wives*, II, i, 155 ff. After Pistol and his companion have left the stage, the two women advance to their husbands. Upon addressing Ford, Mrs. Ford is very sharply answered by him. As Cleustrata attempts to leave the stage, but is hindered by Lysidamus, so, reversing the action, Shakespeare has Ford bid his wife go home.

The quarrel between Caius and Evans which terminates in the abortive duel, I, iv; II, iii; III, i, has as one source the dispute of Olympio and Chalinus at the opening of *Casina* (I, i). The two slaves show first in this scene their rivalry for the hand of Casina. The other Plautine source for the duel is to be found in II, vi, 404 ff. Having arranged that the slaves shall draw lots for Casina, Lysidamus and Cleustrata (in much the same manner as the Host of the Garter brings about the farcical meeting of Caius and Evans) meddle with the hatred their servants have for each other and egg them on to exchanging blows.

The dialogues between Page and Caius, and Page and Fenton, III, ii, 61 ff., in which he tells them that he favors neither of them but Slender instead as a husband for his daughter Anne, are based upon *Casina*, II, iii, iv, v, vi. In these scenes Lysidamus and Cleustrata emphasize their support of the suits of Olympio and of Chalinus, respectively, for Casina. *The Merry Wives*, III, iv, 82 ff., shows Shakespeare's use of Cleustrata's part in the passages above cited. There, on being asked by Fenton for her good offices, Mrs. Page responds that she desires a better husband than Slender for Anne, but does not agree to aid Fenton. As Mrs. Quickly observes, Caius is the mother's choice.

Casina, III, v, which is one of the longest and most amusing scenes in the play, is the source of a number of passages in *The Merry Wives*. Pardalisca, Cleustrata's maid, enters in a pretended fright,

and after much persuasion on his part tells her master, Lysidamus, that Casina has become insane at the idea of marriage and, having got possession of two swords, has terrorized the occupants of the house. Lysidamus, however, is not to be diverted from his purpose, and he vows that insane or sane Casina shall be married as he has planned.

First, a hint for Falstaff's escape from the jealous Ford in the basket of soiled linen[1] (III, iii) occurs in *Casina*, III, v, 664. There Pardalisca tells how the household, to avoid the mad fury of Casina, hid under boxes and beds. The terror of Falstaff at Ford's approach in the scene above cited corresponds to that of Lysidamus in the Plautine play when Pardalisca tells him of Casina's threat against his life.[2]

Fenton's bribe to Mrs. Quickly to secure her in his interest (III, iv, 104) seems founded upon Lysidamus' presents to Pardalisca (ll. 708 ff.). Lysidamus' intention is by means of them to influence the maid so that she will entreat Cleustrata to prevail on Casina to lay aside the arms which Pardalisca reports she has taken up. Thus it will be safe for Lysidamus to enter the house.

Next, Mrs. Quickly's errand (IV, v) is based upon Pardalisca's acting as an emissary of Cleustrata in the same scene.[3] Mrs. Quickly's aim, like that of Pardalisca, is to draw the prospective old dupe—Falstaff in *The Merry Wives*, Lysidamus in *Casina*—into the trap set by the wives. First, however, Pardalisca attempts, apparently by means of her story of Casina's frenzy, to dissuade Lysidamus from proceeding further in his intrigue, but she is unsuccessful in her endeavor. There is nothing to correspond in *The Merry Wives*. There Mrs. Quickly's sole object is so to manage that Falstaff shall agree to meet the two women in Windsor Forest, and it is only after some difficulty that she accomplishes it in V, i.

[1] This incident is almost certainly derived from *The Two Lovers*, yet the fact that a suggestion for it occurs in the Latin play should not be overlooked, since Plautus' incident may have aided in impressing Shakespeare with the comic possibilities of the trick.

[2] Here again the Latin play and the English novel both offer sources for incidents in *The Merry Wives*.

[3] Old women carry messages for the lovers in *Bucciuolo*, in *Lucius and Camillus*, and in *Nerino*, but their part differs from Mrs. Quickly's and Pardalisca's. There is no such character in *The Two Lovers of Pisa*.

It is by no means improbable that Mrs. Quickly's story to Falstaff of the treatment accorded Mrs. Ford by her brutally jealous husband (IV, v, 112 ff.) is based upon Pardalisca's circumstantial story of Casina's insane fury.

Falstaff's misadventures in disguise as the witch of Brainford, as related by him to Mrs. Quickly (IV, v, 117 ff.), are based upon *Casina*, V, ii, iii, iv.[1] Here Olympio and Lysidamus respectively reveal how they have been pommeled by the supposed Casina.[2]

Falstaff's persistence in his pursuit of the merry wives, as shown in V, i, seems suggested by the infatuation of Lysidamus for Casina, as displayed, for instance, in *Casina*, III, vi, in which the old satyr takes tamely insult after insult from Olympio. Lysidamus dares not offend the bailiff because of the important part which is played by him in the plot against Casina. Also, III, v, of Plautus' comedy should be compared. There, Pardalisca's sensational story of Casina's wild insanity has no effect upon Lysidamus' determination to carry out his plans.

Scenes ii and iii of the fifth act of *The Merry Wives*, in which Page and his wife are shown each endeavoring to outwit the other by arranging that Slender and Caius, respectively, shall steal away Anne from the coming masquerade, would appear founded upon *Casina*, II, v, vi. Here Lysidamus and Cleustrata encourage Olympio and Chalinus to persist in their rivalry for Casina and finally resort to the lots to determine which shall have her. In both plays we have the same determination on the part of husband and wife to carry through their plans to a successful conclusion. And in both the cherished schemes are later wrecked—Cleustrata in *Casina* contriving the failure of Lysidamus' project, whereas Mrs. Page, though she succeeds in circumventing her husband, is tricked as well as he.

The culmination of the tricks upon Falstaff (*The Merry Wives*, V, v) owes much more to *Casina* than to *The Two Lovers of Pisa*. Here in Shakespeare's comedy the amorous old gull is finally exposed to the ridicule of nearly all the characters of the

[1] Falstaff's confidences to "Master Brook" (III, v) are derived from the novel.

[2] The scene as presented by Shakespeare (IV, ii) should be compared. There is no disguise of the sort in *The Two Lovers* or in any of the other novels.

play, while Caius and Slender are tricked too. The fifth act of *Casina* deals with the working out of Cleustrata's plot against her husband and his accomplice, Olympio. In V, i, of *Casina* the women of the play wait outside the house of Alcesimus, into which the bridal party has gone, just as the characters of *The Merry Wives* lie in ambush in Windsor Forest for Falstaff. Olympio enters in great haste in V, ii. On being examined, he tells how his supposed wife has beaten him. Next, Lysidamus enters (V, iii). After he has soliloquized over his treatment by "Casina," Chalinus in his disguise confronts his master (V, iv). The old man endeavors to deny any attempt upon "Casina," but he is unable to convince Cleustrata of his truthfulness. At last he throws himself on her mercy, professing his repentance for his past ill conduct.

These four Plautine scenes are the predominant source for the exposure of Falstaff's foolish credulity. Only a very faint suggestion for them is to be found in the Italian or English novels. In both *Casina* and *The Merry Wives* the intention of the principal female characters is the same—to humiliate an old lecher. They lie in wait while the process is in progress. It is shown on the English stage, but related on the Latin. After attempting to carry away the situation the tricked character—Lysidamus in one play, Falstaff in the other—owns himself vanquished and asks for mercy. The latter speaks of "the guiltiness" of his mind (l. 129), while Lysidamus in good set terms asks his wife's forgiveness. In the meantime, in both plays the other characters mock their dupes. The pinching which Falstaff undergoes from the fairies is perhaps suggested by the beating which Chalinus as Casina administers to Lysidamus, an incident which had already served as a source for Falstaff's misfortunes as the witch of Brainford.

The conclusion of the subplot of Anne Page and her lovers is founded upon this last act of *Casina*. In *The Merry Wives*, Caius steals away a fairy in green from the masquerade, believing "her" to be Anne. Slender elopes with a fairy in white. Each is following the directions given him by Mrs. Page and Page, respectively. But, after Falstaff has been sufficiently humiliated, Slender enters in discomfiture and announces that he has run away with a boy. Caius comes in to report indignantly that he has wed a boy whom,

according to Mrs. Page's directions, he had stolen away as Anne. Then Fenton and Anne enter and beg the forgiveness of the Pages. They have eloped and have been married.

Here then occurs in both plays the marriage of a man to another male who is disguised as a woman with whom he is in love. In *Casina* only one such marriage occurs, whereas there are two in *The Merry Wives*, but, in the former, Lysidamus is as much deceived by the false Casina as is Olympio. There is no mistreatment in Shakespeare's play of the gulled suitors, as in *Casina*, but that has evidently been allotted to Falstaff, whose "villainy" is punished by the fairies with their pinchings. Only a trace remains in Slender's boast (ll. 195–97): "Had it not been i' the church, I would have swing'd him, or he should have swing'd me."

The entrance of Fenton and Anne as married is based upon the statement of the Plautine epilogue that, being found a free woman and the daughter of Alcesimus, Casina will be married to Euthynicus. We see, therefore, in both plays, that the true lovers in whose way parental disapproval has stood (and in Plautus an insurmountable social barrier) are at last united with the blessing of the same parents who had before opposed the match.

Thus we see that fourteen, if not fifteen, of the twenty-two scenes of *The Merry Wives* present in sometimes several places and ways more or less striking resemblances to sixteen of the twenty-three scenes of *Casina*. The Shakespearian scenes which appear based upon the Latin play are: I, i;[1] I, iii; I, iv; II, i; II, iii; III, i; III, ii; III, iii; III, iv; III, v; IV, v; V, i; V, ii; V, iii; V, v.

VIII

Finally, perhaps should be considered briefly the question of Shakespeare's knowledge of Latin; for there is no evidence of an Elizabeth translation of *Casina*. However, this matter need not delay one long. Arguments pro and con have been made for over two centuries, yet no definite conclusion has been generally reached. To the writer it seems probable that Shakespeare read Latin with fair proficiency. This appears evident to him from the fact alone

[1] See p. 411, n. 2, above.

that the dramatist drew upon Plautus' *Menaechmi, Amphritruo, Mostellaria,* and *Miles Gloriosus.* Sir Sidney Lee in his *Life*[1] says: "Aubrey's report that 'he knew Latin pretty well' is incontestable. The original speech of Ovid and Seneca lay well within his grasp." Later Sir Sidney says of Shakespeare and Plautus:[2] "He had read the old dramatist at school." Evidence in support of Shakespeare's Latinity has also been given by Professor J. Churton Collins[3] and others.

But it should moreover be remembered that possibly Shakespeare had access to manuscript translations of Plautine plays (as some critics say that he utilized for the *Comedy of Errors* an unprinted form of W. W.'s English version of *Menaechmi*) or an obliging friend read certain of the comedies to him in English, or perhaps only outlined them to him. In truth, the important fact is that Shakespeare knew the plays of Plautus in some form or other. Whether this form was in the Latin or not is of secondary importance.[4]

IX

From the foregoing discussion the writer feels justified in concluding that one of the sources of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is the *Casina* of Plautus. This conclusion he bases chiefly upon the resemblances of the two plays in plot and characters, although there are few places where verbal borrowing or translation seems discernible. It is true that there are many deviations from the story of *Casina;* the impartial and judicial reader must recognize, however, that those which are made from the plot of *The Two Lovers of Pisa* and from that of *Philenio* are as great. Furthermore, a comparison of any Shakespearian play with its source will reveal a similar alteration of the original. Here, too, in *The Merry Wives* is a situation which lent itself peculiarly to free adaptation: the problem of combining three different stories—one, that of a play, the two

[1] P. 22. [2] P. 109.

[3] "Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar" in *Studies in Shakespeare,* pp. 1–95.

[4] Professor Irving Babbitt says in his *Literature and the American College,* p. 204, note: "The atmosphere in which Shakespeare wrote was so saturated with Greek and Latin influence as to make his direct acquaintance with the classics a secondary question."

others from novels—into a unified drama. With the same freedom displayed in his combination and adaptation of *The Taming of a Shrew* and *Supposes* as *The Taming of the Shrew*, Shakespeare altered the plots from *Tarleton's News*, from *The Palace of Pleasure*, and from Plautus, and wove them into a well-knit play—*The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

R. S. FORSYTHE

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

NOTE.—Until the foregoing article was in type in April, 1920, the writer had not seen Miss Cornelia C. Coulter's paper, "The Plautine Tradition in Shakespeare," published in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, for January, 1920 (Vol. XIX, pp. 66–83). "A Plautine Source of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*" was completed and submitted to *Modern Philology* in August, 1919. The present writer's conclusions are, therefore, independent of those of Miss Coulter. They differ, too, considerably from hers, for he finds much more than a "faint" reminiscence of *Casina* in *The Merry Wives* ("The Plautine Tradition," p. 75), and he does not derive Falstaff from the Plautine *miles gloriosus* (pp. 80, 83). R. S. F.

THE ABBÉ LE BLANC AND ENGLISH LITERATURE

In the seventeenth century, says Joseph Texte of the French, "nous étions dans l'heureuse persuasion que tout ce qui n'était pas français mangeait du foin et marchait à quatre pattes."[1] The eighteenth century changed that. The current, which in the first quarter of the century had been setting more and more toward England, began in the second quarter to gather more strength for its onward sweep. Not only the Augustans, Addison, Pope, and Swift, were beginning to be known, but even the "barbarian" Shakespeare was awakening curiosity and calling forth a strange mingling of timid admiration and violent abuse. Boyer's early notice of the poet in 1700,[2] the "Shakees Pear" of the *Journal des savants*,[3] the "Chacsper" of the 1715 translation of Collier's *Short View*,[4] the "Dissertation sur la poésie angloise" in the *Journal littéraire de la Haye*[5]—all these had prepared the way and then had sunk into comparative oblivion at the appearance of men of greater talents whose interests also turned in the same direction.

The Swiss Protestant, Béat-Louis de Muralt, had been in England as long ago as 1694 and had made good use of his time, but his famous *Lettres sur les Anglois et sur les François*, which Voltaire did not disdain and which Rousseau used and esteemed,[6] were slow in appearing. Not until 1725 were they published but, as early as 1727, a second edition became necessary.[7] Muralt apologized for treating such a *bagatelle* as literature and relegated it to a place of secondary importance. Moreover, he preferred Ben Jonson to "Schakspear."[8]

[1] Joseph Texte, *J. J. Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire* (Paris, 1895), p. 16.

[2] J. J. Jusserand, *Shakespeare en France sous l'ancien régime* (Paris, 1898), pp. 141–42.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 147. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 140. [5] *Ibid.*, pp. 148–49.

[6] Cf. my article, "The Sources of Rousseau's Edouard Bomston," *Modern Philology*, XVII, 134–37.

[7] Muralt, *Lettres sur les Anglois*, 2d ed., Cologne, 1727. Cf., for notice of other rapidly succeeding editions and reprints, Otto von Greyerz, Introd. to Muralt's *Lettres* (Bern, 1897), pp. xviii–xix.

[8] Muralt, *Lettres*, Cologne, 1727, p. 34.

The attitude of Voltaire as expressed in the *Lettres philosophiques* of 1734 is perhaps too widely stressed. It should be balanced by the more favorable view presented by two works which antedate the *Philosophical Letters*, namely, the *Discours sur la tragédie* prefixed to *Brutus* and published in 1731, and the French version of the *Essai sur la poésie épique* of 1733. In the Preface to *Brutus* for instance, we find Voltaire exclaiming:

> Au milieu de tant de fautes grossières, avec quel ravissement je voyais Brutus, tenant encore un poignard teint du sang de César, assembler le peuple romain, et lui parler ainsi du haut de la tribune aux harangues!

In closing, Voltaire writes:

> Peut-être les Français ne souffriraient pas que l'on fît paraître sur leurs théâtres un chœur composé d'artisans et de plébéiens romains; que le corps sanglant de César y fût exposé aux yeux du peuple, et qu'on excitât ce peuple à la vengeance du haut de la tribune aux harangues; c'est à la coutume, qui est la reine de ce monde, à changer le goût des nations, et à tourner en plaisir les objets de notre aversion.[1]

Here, even taking into account the fact that Voltaire is preparing the public for his own innovations, we have what is really a quite fair and broad-minded attitude. He is sincere in his admiration. His desire to imitate English drama proves that. In the *Discours sur la tragédie* likewise, after admitting that Shakespeare is in part "monstrueux" and "absurde," Voltaire says he must admit that the English are right in admiring him.

> Il est impossible que toute une nation se trompe en fait de sentiment, et ait tort d'avoir du plaisir. Ils voyaient comme moi les fautes grossières de leur auteur favori; mais ils sentaient mieux que moi ses beautés, d'autant plus singulières que ce sont des éclairs qui ont brillé dans la nuit la plus profonde.

Then follow these words, which are the high-water mark of Voltaire's appreciation of Shakespeare:

> Tel est le privilège du génie d'invention: il se fait une route où personne n'a marché avant lui; il court sans guide, sans art, sans règle; il s'égare dans sa carrière, mais il laisse loin derrière lui tout ce qui n'est que raison et qu'exactitude.[2]

The passage speaks for itself and needs no further comment.

[1] *Œuvres de Voltaire*, II (Paris, 1883), 316–18.

[2] *Ibid.*, VIII, 317–18.

In 1738 Louis Riccoboni, the famous Lelio of the *Comédie Italienne*, who had been in England about ten years before at the same time as Voltaire, published his *Réflexions historiques et critiques sur les différens théâtres de l'Europe*, in which, while hesitant and timid, the author nevertheless risks the bold observation that "les beautés des tragédies angloises sont au-dessus de toutes les beautés que les théâtres de l'Europe peuvent nous montrer."[1]

The Abbé Prévost too, indefatigable novelist that he was, found time and inclination to spread the vogue of English literature. His first appreciations appeared in Volume V of the *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité* in 1731, the year of Voltaire's Preface to *Brutus*. This success was followed within a few years by other novels, *Cléveland*, whose hero is an Englishman, the *Doyen de Killerine*, whose chief character is an Irish priest, and the *Mémoires de M. de Montcal*, the scene of which is laid in England and Ireland. At the same time appeared the twenty volumes of Prévost's periodical publication, *Le Pour et Contre*,[2] which made a specialty of English literature. In 1742 Prévost took France by storm with his translation of Richardson's *Pamela*. It is necessary to correct the widely held opinion that Prévost was far in advance of his time and distinguished especially for his enlightened appreciation of Shakespeare. Fair minded and moderate he was and he did much to further the cause of English literature in France, but he must not be thought of as a wildly enthusiastic champion of Shakespearean drama.[3] Prévost has had his legend, picturesque, alluring, a piquant contrast to Voltaire, but untrue.

So, with the way thus clearly pointed out, it is not strange that a young man of thirty, eager for a literary career, should in this day turn his steps toward England. In fact, the Abbé Le Blanc bore with him a commission, so to speak, from no less a person than La Chaussée, who wrote him under date of May 1, 1737:

> Je ne doute point qu'il n'y ait à profiter sur le Parnasse anglois et je m'en rapporte bien à vous pour ramasser les fleurs qui sont à votre usage et

[1] Riccoboni, *Réflexions*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1740), pp. 138–39.

[2] Published by Didot (Paris, 1733–40).

[3] For a more detailed study of this question, cf. my article, "The Abbé Prévost and Shakespeare," *Modern Philology*, XVII, 177–98.

qui peuvent être transplantées ici. On compte sur vous l'hiver prochain. ... Je vais me mettre à l'anglois et je ferai venir les pièces qu'il faut voir quand on veut se donner une idée du théâtre comique anglois.[1]

Whatever La Chaussée may have done with his English,[2] Le Blanc did not fail to make use of his. In 1737 he began to write to friends of some prominence in France letters on England and the English and continued to do so until 1744. In 1745, under the title of *Lettres d'un François*, the collection was published without chronological arrangement[3] in three of those small russet volumes that the eighteenth century loved so well.

The Abbé Le Blanc (Jean Bernard) was born in 1707 and died in 1781. Maupertuis offered him a position at the court of Prussia, but Le Blanc refused it. Through Mme de Pompadour, he obtained the sinecure of "historiographe des batiments du roi," which he kept throughout his life. The author of some verse and of a tragedy, *Aben-Saïd*, which was twelve times played at the Comédie Française, the Abbé Le Blanc chose no ill means of augmenting his fame when he decided to pass seven years in England. In fact, his *Lettres* were read with avidity and brought their author into prominence.

Le Blanc's impression of English character is not essentially different from that given by his predecessors and already becoming traditional.[4] According to the French writer, the English pride themselves on being reasonable and on thinking deeply,[5] they are frank,[6] distinguished for their good sense,[7] impatient of restraint and tenacious in their purposes,[8] eccentric,[9] violent and extreme in

[1] *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* (1919), pp. 98–99.

[2] M. Jusserand (*op. cit.*, p. 192) thinks that La Chaussée was strongly influenced by English literature. M. Lanson favors the opposite opinion that such influence, if it existed at all, was slight (*Nivelle de La Chaussée et la comédie larmoyante*, pp. 130–31).

[3] The *Lettres d'un François* were published by Jean Neaulme at The Hague in 1745 with this introductory note by the editor: "Ces *Lettres* ont été écrites d'Angleterre depuis l'année 1737 jusques vers la fin de l'année dernière 1744. L'auteur qui connoît tout le mérite et de celles que M. de Muralt, et de celles que l'un des plus grands écrivains de notre siècle ont publiées sur les mœurs et le gouvernement des Anglois, ne pensoit point alors à rendre les siennes publiques; ainsi il n'en a point retenu les dates sur des copies qu'il n'avoit gardées que pour son usage particulier: cela est cause qu'on n'a pu les imprimer suivant le tems où elles ont été écrites, et qu'il y en a au III. volume qui devroient être au I."

[4] Cf. *Modern Philology*, XVII, 131–37, for the views of Muralt, Prévost, and Rousseau.

[5] Le Blanc, *Lettres d'un François*, I, 2, 92; II, 342; III, 297.

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 197. [7] *Ibid.*, II, 181. [8] *Ibid.*, I, 59.

[9] *Ibid.*, I, 84–85, 144; III, 294.

everything,[1] intemperate,[2] of brusque and unpleasing manners,[3] afflicted with "spleen,"[4] of gloomy and harsh exterior,[5] filled with national pride,[6] but withal honorable,[7] kindly, and possessed of very lovable, human qualities,[8] when once they are known and understood. One should, however, be careful not to form too favorable and exaggerated an opinion of them.

Ce sont des hommes comme les autres, qui connoissent la raison et ne la suivent pas toujours.[9]

Ne croyez pas cependant les Anglois plus sages que nous; leurs ridicules sont différens, mais les hommes sont partout les mêmes.[10]

Bien des gens ont peut-être parmi nous une opinion trop favorable des Anglois; ils ne connoissent la nation que par ce qu'elle a de plus poli. ... Des hommes tels que Mylord Boolinbroke, ou Mylord Chesterfield sont rares, non-seulement dans leurs pays, mais dans leur siècle même.[11]

Moreover, Le Blanc admits frankly the danger of attempting to generalize about a whole nation.

Ces jugemens que l'on porte de toute une nation sont rarement justes et presque toujours téméraires. D'ailleurs il n'est peut-être point de peuple dans l'Europe dont il soit plus difficile de donner une idée générale que de celui parmi lequel je vis aujourd'hui; les Anglois sont aussi différens entre eux que leur nation est elle-même différente des autres.[12]

Finally, he protects himself, or perhaps defends himself, against criticism by this fair, tactful, but cautious statement:

Comme il est de l'homme de se tromper, et de l'honnête homme de reconnoître son erreur, j'avoue de bonne foi que je crains de n'avoir pas connu tout le mérite des Anglois, lorsque j'ai vécu parmi eux. Je puis avoir été choqué de ce qui n'est que l'opposé de nos défauts. Ce qui m'a paru contraire aux bienséances, ne l'est peut-être qu'à nos usages.[13]

As to the vogue of the English language in France, the following passage offers interesting testimony:

Nous avons mis depuis peu leur langue au rang des langues sçavantes; les femmes même l'apprennent, et ont renoncé à l'italien pour étudier celle de ce peuple philosophe. Il n'en est point dans la province d'Armande et de Bélise qui ne veuille sçavoir l'anglois.[14]

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 32, 215.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 51.
[3] *Ibid.*, III, 298.
[4] *Ibid.*, I, 237, 251; III, 16.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 47, 173, 323; II, 69.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, 10, 12, 93–94.
[7] *Ibid.*, III, 294.
[8] *Ibid.*, I, 15; II, 263; III, 294.
[9] *Ibid.*, I, 15.
[10] *Ibid.*, I, 21.
[11] *Ibid.*, III, 64–65.
[12] *Ibid.*, I, 19.
[13] *Ibid.*, III, 379–80.
[14] *Ibid.*, II, 334.

English is a harsher language than French, thinks Le Blanc, but in spite of that fact it is a better poetic medium.[1] "Le françois paroît être la langue de la raison, l'anglois celle de l'enthousiasme."[2] It is especially adapted to rendering expression to the emotions, love, friendship, grief, and despair.[3] The English rarely seek anything but force of expression; most of them do not even admit "la distinction des expressions nobles ou basses."[4] In time doubtless their language will acquire more polish and, like French, lose much of its force while at the same time gaining in beauty.[5] It goes without saying that, in Le Blanc's opinion, the English lack taste.[6] Nevertheless, their example can be of use to the French.

Anglois, Italien, François, qu'importe qui nous éclaire, pourvu qu'on nous conduise au sanctuaire de la vérité.[7]

Les François ne sont si remplis de préjugés que parce que ne sortant pas de chez eux, ils ne connoissent pas tout ce qu'ont d'excellent les nations qui nous environnent.[8]

English literature held an important place among the topics treated by Le Blanc's pen. The Augustans of course attract his attention. "M. Pope" is, as one would expect, "le Despréaux d'Angleterre."[9] It is the comparison already consecrated by Le Blanc's predecessors. Pope is the authority "à qui je m'en rapporte pour tout ce qui regarde les vers anglois."[10] "Les deux Essais de M. Pope que M. l'abbé Du Resnel a mis si heureusement en vers françois ont reçu les applaudissemens qu'ils méritent."[11] Pope is cited several times[12] and once is criticized unfavorably,[13] but nothing of special interest is brought forward. Addison is generally treated with much more respect and is quoted more frequently than Pope.[14] He is "l'auteur anglois qui a le mieux peint les mœurs de sa nation,"[15] though in another place Le Blanc says that "il a flatté sa nation

[1] Le Blanc, I, 305.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 306.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 118.
[4] *Ibid.*, I, 323–24.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 108.
[6] *Ibid.*, II, 246. Cf. I, 317–18; II, 203, 216.
[7] *Ibid.*, III, 249.
[8] *Ibid.*, I, 50.
[9] *Ibid.*, I, 159.
[10] *Ibid.*, I, 162.
[11] *Ibid.*, II, 72.
[12] *Ibid.*, II, 56.
[13] *Ibid.*, III, 337.
[14] *Ibid.*, I, 109, 113, 166, 174; II, 113, 153, 315; III, 75.
[15] *Ibid.*, I, 68.

dans les portraits qu'il en a faits."[1] His *Cato* is "une des tragédies qui fait le plus d'honneur au théâtre anglois."[2] Evidently Le Blanc, like most of his contemporaries, prefers drama that is classical in form. As an example of Steele's work, Le Blanc recommends to his friend, La Chaussée, *The Conscious Lovers*, "une des meilleures comédies du théâtre anglois,"[3] translates Act IV, scene 1, and praises the attack on duelling. Since, however, Prévost had already translated the whole play in *Le Pour et Contre*,[4] Le Blanc's originality is of the slightest. Swift of course—the phrase had been made current by Voltaire—is an English Rabelais.[5] He is cited a propos of the supposed bad taste of English poets,[6] and it is noted that the French have welcomed "tout ce qu'on nous a traduit des ouvrages du docteur Swift,"[7] but Le Blanc, like Prévost[8] before him, shudders at the bitterly satirical proposal for using the children of the poor people of Ireland as food for the rich.

> On sent bien que c'est une satire violente contre le gouvernement d'Angleterre qui tient l'Irelande dans l'oppression. Mais on manque quelquefois le but faute d'adresse. L'auteur a voulu faire rire et il révolte. Une satire qu'on eût pu relire avec plaisir eût sûrement fait plus d'effet qu'un écrit que le dégoût fait tomber des mains.[9]

Shaftesbury, Le Blanc considers "un de leurs plus judicieux critiques,"[10] and his strictures against the English stage as often "une scène de carnage"[11] are cited from the *Advice to an Author*. Shaftesbury, like Congreve, Addison, Swift, and Pope, has distinguished himself above most English authors because of his study of "nos bons auteurs du dernier siècle" and of "les grands modèles de l'antiquité."[12] Gay's *Beggars' Opera* arouses Le Blanc's ire. Its characters are "brigands et coupe-jarrets," but it has long entertained the London populace and, Le Blanc notes with regret, continues to do so.[13] Richardson's *Pamela* has held the Abbé's interest

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 14.
[2] *Ibid.*, III, 131. Cf. Voltaire, *Œuvres*, II, 322.
[3] *Ibid.*, II, 122.
[4] *Le Pour et Contre*, VIII, 109–321.
[5] Le Blanc, I, 115.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, 110–11.
[7] *Ibid.*, II, 72.
[8] *Le Pour et Contre*, I, 298.
[9] Le Blanc, I, 283, note. A translation follows, pp. 284–301.
[10] *Ibid.*, I, 119.
[11] *Ibid.*, III, 187, note. Cf. III, 167–68, note *b*.
[12] *Ibid.*, III, 26.
[13] *Ibid.*, III, 209. Cf. III, 184, note *a* and III, 231, note.

powerfully "malgré les longueurs et un fonds de mœurs basses qui peuvent révolter la plupart des lecteurs."[1]

So much for the contemporary, or nearly contemporary, period. Some Restoration writers were also treated by Le Blanc.

Dryden is "un des poètes anglois qui a eu le plus d'esprit."[2] He is praised for his translation of Virgil.[3] *All for Love* is spoken of favorably in one passage and unfavorably in another.

> C'est de tous les ouvrages dramatiques de ce poète, celui où il a mis le plus d'art et c'est une des meilleures tragédies du théâtre anglois; elle est traduite dans le *Pour et Contre* de M. l'abbé Prévost.[4]

But a little later the French author writes:

> Antoine plongé dans la mollesse perd l'empire de l'univers: c'est ce que M. Dryden appelle le *Monde bien Perdu*. Racine mérite d'être critiqué pour avoir mis sur la scène des héros trop efféminés, mais ce n'étoit pas au poète anglois à lui en faire un reproche.[5]

Evidently the first passage is Le Blanc's real estimate of the play as a whole, while the latter is but the reaction of his national pride against Dryden's criticism of Racine. "Otwai" and Southerne, "deux des plus grands tragiques du théâtre anglois,"[6] are both criticized for the mingling of tragic and comic elements.

> *La Venise préservée* d'Otway, une des pièces les plus tragiques du théâtre anglois, est coupée á chaque scène par une intrigue du comique le plus bas et le plus trivial. *Oroonoko* et le *Fatal Mariage* de Southern ont le même défaut, ou plutôt c'est celui de beaucoup de tragédies angloises, où il y a d'ailleurs de grandes beautés.[7]

Le Blanc translates for Bouhier Act III, scene 2, of Rowe's *Tamerlane* and comments: Cette scène est traitée avec art et écrite avec beaucoup de force."[8] Congreve's borrowings from Molière are noted,[9] but he is called "le comique le plus sage et le premier de tous."[10] The *Way of the World* is praised as his masterpiece[11] and as best

[1] Le Blanc, I, 280.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 324.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 307.
[4] *Ibid.*, III, 151–52, note *m*.
[5] *Ibid.*, III, 173, note *b*.
[6] *Ibid.*, III, 163, note *b*.
[7] *Ibid.*, III, 143–44, note *x*.
[8] *Ibid.*, II, 198–201.
[9] *Ibid.*, III, 129–30.
[10] *Ibid.*, III, 182, note *a*.
[11] *Ibid.*, III, 313–14, note.

portraying his age. Nevertheless, Restoration writers in general receive Le Blanc's condemnation.

Les écrivains de ce tems-là ... ne furent exacts ni sur la morale, ni sur le style. D'un côté ils secouèrent le joug de toute bienséance; de l'autre ils sacrifièrent le jugement à l'esprit, c'est-à-dire, au mauvais goût; car l'esprit affecté ou déplacé est réellement un défaut."[1]

Of the poets of the period:

Cowley pétille d'esprit, le Comte de Rochester ne respecte pas même la pudeur, Waller le sage, Waller est peut-être le seul qui se soit préservé de l'une et l'autre contagion.[2]

Vous me demandez quel étoit ce Waller dont S. Evremond parle avec tant d'éloge. C'est un des auteurs à qui la poésie angloise a le plus d'obligation. C'est le premier de ceux de cette nation qui ait consulté l'harmonie dans l'arrangement des mots [yet Shakespeare had already written!] et suivi le goût dans le choix des idées. Il a autant de galanterie et plus de naturel que Voiture, autant de feu et plus de correction que Chaulieu. C'est de l'avis de ceux qui s'y connoissent, le poète le plus aimable et le plus châtié que les Anglois ayent eu.[3]

As an example of Waller's work, Le Blanc gives an adaptation of the fable of Apollo and Daphne written for the Countess of Sunderland.[4] Pryor is barely mentioned,[5] but Milton rightly receives more consideration than others of his period.

Avec un peu plus de sagesse et de goût, Milton eût fait un chef-d'œuvre de son *Paradis perdu*.[6]

On doit combler d'éloges l'heureux enthousiasme qui a produit un poème tel que le *Paradis perdu;* mais peut-on ne pas condamner en même tems celui d'un lecteur qui se passionnera pour cet ouvrage au point de n'en pas voir les défauts.[7]

Le Blanc observes that it was Addison who raised Milton's work from the neglect into which it had fallen in consequence of his attachment to Cromwell's cause.[8] The following passage is significant from the point of view of awakening interest in nature. It stresses the subjective attitude and points toward romanticism.

Milton peint non-seulement la fraîcheur du matin et la beauté de l'émail d'une prairie, ou du verd d'une colline, il exprime jusqu'aux sentimens de joye et de plaisir que ces objets excitent dans notre âme.[9]

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 106.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 106–7.
[3] *Ibid.*, II, 82.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, 83–84.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 11.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, 318.
[7] *Ibid.*, III, 250.
[8] *Ibid.*, III, 109.
[9] *Ibid.*, II, 207.

J'aimerois assez vous entretenir de la poésie des anglois; mais Milton dont un de vos confrères nous a donné une si belle traduction, vous en fait mieux connoître le génie que tout ce que je pourrois vous en dire.[1]

Finally, Milton receives this high praise:

L'Angleterre a eu plusieurs poètes célèbres. Il en est peu dans aucune nation qu'on puisse comparer à Milton.[2]

Concerning all the authors so far treated, Le Blanc says much that is judicious and fair, but he discusses none of them in much detail and throughout we feel that the Frenchman has expressed no new and stimulating ideas for the consideration of his countrymen. He cannot in this respect measure up to what had already been done by Muralt, Voltaire, and even Prévost.

One distinction, however, he has, and, either for a Frenchman or for an Englishman of the period, it is no slight one. He has read Chaucer.

L'anglois d'il y a trois ou quatre cens ans étoit encore plus mélangé du françois qu'il ne l'est aujourd'hui. Je ne sçai même si la connoissance de l'anglois de ces tems-là ne seroit pas très utile à ceux qui veulent entendre notre vieux françois. La lecture de Chaucer m'a rendu celle de nos anciens poètes plus facile.[3]

How much knowledge of Chaucer, Le Blanc may have acquired is problematical, but at any rate it is most interesting to learn that he got even so far as to read him at all.

As we come now to the Elizabethan age, it is of interest to note the pre-eminence Le Blanc accords to it, especially in view of the comparative barrenness of his treatment of other English authors.

C'est sous le règne d'Elizabeth qu'elle [la langue anglaise] en a été le plus près [de la perfection]. Cette langue fut alors enrichie par la traduction de la Bible, de beaucoup de mots et de tours orientaux. Sir Walter Raleigh, un des ministres de cette grande reine, qui elle-même possédoit plusieurs langues, le célèbre Spencer et Fairfax, sont encore comptés au rang des meilleurs écrivains de leur nation.[4]

It is significant that Le Blanc, through Swift, has been led to notice the great part played by the King James Bible in the formation of English style. Voltaire, however, had already called attention to the same fact.

[1] Le Blanc, I, 155.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 204.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 104–5.
[4] *Ibid.*, I, 105–6.

It remains to treat the most important and interesting part of Le Blanc's literary criticism, that which deals with Shakespeare.

Shakespeare, says Le Blanc, is "le plus original" of all authors ancient or modern, and far superior to his rival, Ben Jonson, who, in Dryden's phrase, is merely "un sçavant plagiaire des anciens." "Il a l'imagination aussi riche que forte; il peint tout ce qu'il voit, et il embellit tout ce qu'il peint." An example of this is the description of Cleopatra's appearance before Antony. But, alas! though Shakespeare rises to the sublime, he sinks also to the lowest depths. "Ceux de nos François qui en ont parlé, l'ont loué et ne l'ont pas jugé."[1] A scene from the first part of *Henry VI* is praised as worthy of the "grand Corneille," and likewise a selection from the second part of *Henry VI*, a translation of which is given, but the comic scenes are severely censured.[2] Shakespeare is the enemy of all constraint. He wrote his plays, now in prose, now in verse, now with rhyme, now without. His plays contain great beauties, but great faults also.[3] His successors have copied his faults, but have lacked his genius.[4] Nevertheless, he is the poet "qui a le mieux peint et la nature, et les effets des passions et les défauts attachés à l'humanité en général et ceux qui sont particuliers à sa nation."[5] He is the foremost dramatic author of England, a truly great poet, but no translations in French would do other than harm to his reputation.[6] In his finest passages he is not inferior to any other author ancient or modern, but unfortunately directly after his best scenes we must expect to find one of the most ridiculous examples of low comedy. The English excuse this, but the French will not be so indulgent. The admiration of the English for Shakespeare is excessive. We, the

[1] Yet already, Voltaire had spoken, Prévost too, and Riccoboni, and none of these had failed to point out "faults." D'Argens in 1738 had written of the "état [de barbarie] du théâtre anglois." "Je n'ai jamais vu tant de génie et si peu de bons ouvrages," and Shakespeare is included in this condemnation (*Lettres juives*, IV, 237).

[2] Le Blanc, III, 49–63.

[3] Cf. Charles Gildon, *Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare* (Rowe's ed. of Shakespeare, 1709–10), VII, 425.

[4] Le Blanc, I, 309–10. Cf. Voltaire, *Œuvres*, II, 318.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 182.

[6] In spite of the great degree of truth contained in this remark as far as translations in French are concerned, it is of some piquancy in view of the fact that La Place's translation appeared in 1745, the same year as Le Blanc's *Lettres*, which thus condemned translations of Shakespeare as of little use after all.

French, would object to seeing the power and sublimity of Corneille mingled with low and trivial comedy, puns, and plays upon words.

Le Blanc translates the speeches of Brutus and of Antony after the death of Caesar, and then comments:

> Cette scène, où sont ces deux chefs-d'œuvre, finit par le comique le plus bas et le plus ridicule. Antoine n'a pas plutôt inspiré au peuple l'ardeur de venger la mort de César, qu'on voit paroître un nouveau personnage. Le peuple l'entoure avec empressement, lui demande quel est son nom, d'où il vient et où il va, s'il est garçon ou marié, etc. Il répond qu'il s'appelle Cinna, et aussitôt le peuple s'écrie: "C'est un des conspirateurs, mettons-le en pièces: non, messieurs, dit le pauvre misérable, tout effrayé, je suis Cinna le poète.—N'importe, reprend la populace, déchirons-le pour ses mauvais vers.—Voilà comme finit d'ordinaire tout le tragique de Shakespeare, voilà comme toutes ses pièces sont bigarrées de scènes pathétiques et de scènes boufonnes."[1]

As for the conference between Brutus, Cassius, Octavius, and Antony, "à la grossièreté des injures qu'ils se disent les uns aux autres dans cette entrevue, on ne peut pas les prendre pour des Romains." Prévost's attitude toward a similar criticism is more enlightened.[2] Shakespeare is not afraid, notes Le Blanc, to bring Caesar on the stage "en bonnet de nuit" (probably nightgown). "Vous sentez par là combien il doit le dégrader." As to Falstaff, he is but a crude buffoon.

> A l'égard du style, c'est la partie qui distingue le plus Shakespeare des autres poètes de sa nation, c'est celui où il excelle. Il peint tout ce qu'il exprime. Il anime tout ce qu'il dit. Il parle pour ainsi dire une langue qui lui est propre, et c'est ce qui le rend si difficile à traduire. Il faut pourtant avouer aussi, que si quelquefois ses expressions sont sublimes, souvent il donne dans le gigantesque. Ainsi, dans cette pièce de *Jules-César*, Portia, femme de Brutus, se plaint à lui de ce qu'il a des secrets pour elle, et lui demande si *elle ne demeure plus que dans les faubourgs de son bon plaisir?* Croiroit-on que cette phrase ridicule pût être de l'auteur de la harangue que vous venez de lire? D'un autre côté, je ne puis passer sous silence un trait de cette tragédie, qui marque, ce me semble, autant de finesse d'esprit que le

[1] Evidently Le Blanc catches no glimpse of the value of such a scene in portraying the fickle violence of a mob.

[2] *Pour et Contre*, V, 40–41. Of the quarrel between Octavia and Cleopatra, Prévost observes: "Si l'une étoit Romaine et l'autre Reine d'Egypte, elles ne laissoient pas toutes deux d'être femmes." Le Blanc, unlike Prévost, thought that a Roman was a superhuman being.

discours de Brutus suppose d'élévation. Décius dit, en parlant de César: "Il se plaît à entendre dire, *qu'on surprend des lions avec des filets et les hommes avec des flatteries, etc., mais quand je lui dis qu'il haît les flatteurs, il m'approuve et ne s'aperçoit pas que c'est en cela que je le flatte le plus.*"

However, when all is said, Shakespeare will never be known by those who do not read English. He cannot be translated and still remain Shakespeare.[1]

Le Blanc, even though he found certain details to criticize, deserves special mention for noting Shakespeare's pre-eminence in the matter of style. M. Jusserand has already called attention to the fact.[2] It is worth noting too that Texte, while he considered the influence of Shakespeare to have been slight in France so far as the development of historical drama and the breaking up of classical tragedy are concerned, attributed great influence to Shakespeare's style.[3] This renders the Abbé's observations the more significant.

Le Blanc thinks the English need the bit more than they need the spur. They regard all rules as arbitrary, unwilling to recognize that these rules are but copied

d'après la nature et qu'elles ne sont autre chose que les moyens les plus sûres pour y arriver. Leur fameux Shakespeare est un exemple frappant du danger que l'on court à s'en écarter. Ce poète, un des plus grands génies qui ayent peut-être jamais existé, pour avoir ignoré les règles des anciens ou pour n'avoir pas voulu les suivre, n'a pas produit un seul ouvrage qui ne soit un monstre dans son espèce; s'il y a dans tous des endroits admirables, il n'y en a pas un dont on puisse soutenir la lecture d'un bout à l'autre,[4]

all of which is extreme enough to satisfy the most rabid adversary of Shakespeare.

To Crébillon, Le Blanc writes as follows:

Dans vos ouvrages la terreur naît plus de la force des sentimens et de l'énergie des expressions que de l'horreur du spectacle. ... Il n'en est pas ainsi de Shakespeare; quoique personne n'ait donné plus de force que lui à ses expressions, la terreur qu'il inspire est due principalement aux spectacles affreux qu'il expose sous les yeux. Dans sa tragédie du *Maure de Venise* on voit Othello étouffer sa femme dans son lit.[5]

[1] Le Blanc, II, 73–81.

[2] J. J. Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

[3] Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la littérature française*, VII, 721–22.

[4] Le Blanc, I, 313–14.

[5] Thomas Rymer in 1693 had summarized his views on *Othello* as follows: "Whatever rubs or difficulty may stick on the Bark, the moral, sure, of this Fable is very instructive. First, This may be a caution to all Maidens of Quality how, without their Parents'

Le Blanc then gives the plot of *Titus Andronicus*, and concludes:

Je finis, monsieur; car je m'imagine que vous n'êtes pas moins las que moi de tant d'horreurs. Quelque méchans que soient les hommes, je doute qu'il y en ait d'aussi abominables que le Maure sanguinaire et la cruelle Tamora. Corneille a fait, dit-on, les hommes plus vertueux et plus grands qu'ils ne sont. On a reproché à Euripide de les avoir fait trop méchans; mais Shakespeare les a faits plus scélérats peut-être que la nature humaine ne la comporte.[1] ... Sans les détails de quelques morceaux pathétiques, on la prendroit plutôt pour le délire d'une imagination déréglée que pour l'ouvrage d'un grand poète.[2]

Le Blanc's attitude toward *Othello* is entirely conventional for a Frenchman of the time. Especially interesting is the attempt of Le Blanc to shock the great "shocker," Crébillon. We are likely now to forget that Shakespeare ever had any part in the writing of so sanguinary a play as *Titus Andronicus*, but it is not at all strange that Le Blanc should have come upon it and been repelled. He does, however, frankly admit that it is an extreme example, that it is no longer played, and that some in fact do not consider it Shakespeare's work at all.

In another passage addressed to Crébillon, we find Le Blanc interested in the sources of *Hamlet*, *Cymbeline*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Othello*. He summarizes the plot of *Hamlet*, and refers incidentally to the "belle édition des Œuvres de Shakespeare" by Pope. Then follows this interesting comment on the ghosts of Shakespeare's plays:

Les spectateurs ont assez de peine à se défendre de la terreur que les scènes de cette espèce inspirent dans Shakespeare. Il donne à ses expressions une force qui étonne toujours.[3] Il anime les phantomes qu'il fait paroître. ... Les objets du monde les plus ridicules, trois sorcières et leur chaudron jouent un très grand rôle dans sa tragédie de *Macbeth*.[4]

---

consent, they run away with Blackamoors. Secondly, This may be a warning to all good Wives that they look well to their Linnen. Thirdly, This may be a lesson to Husbands that before their Jealousie be Tragical, the proofs may be mathematical" ("Short View of Tragedy," in Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, II, 221).

[1] Le Blanc, III, 87–98.

[2] *Ibid.*, III, 96.

[3] Cf. *supra*, p. 91, the passage on Shakespeare's style.

[4] Cf. Voltaire, *Œuvres*, II, 320. Cf. D'Argens in the *Lettres juives* (1738). "J'ai vu dans une des plus belles pièces angloises trois sorcières descendre du haut du théâtre à califourchon sur un manche-à-balai, et venir faire bouillir des herbes dans un chaudron" (IV, 236).

He then translates parts of the scenes between the ghost and Hamlet and comments:

C'est dans les scènes de cette espèce que Shakespeare prouve bien qu'il étoit grand poète; plus elles sont contre la nature, plus il y employe d'art et de force pour s'y soutenir. ... La plus grande beauté de cet acte (3e) et peut-être de toute la tragédie, est ce monologue si célèbre, où il examine si un homme malheureux doit se tuer ou non. M. de Voltaire en a donné une traduction en vers où il a rendu toute la force de l'original, ainsi vous trouverez bon que je vous y renvoye.[1] Il y a aussi des beautés dans la scène où le roi se sent pressé de ses remords.

This scene the Abbé translates, as also the one in which Hamlet refuses to kill the king at prayers. A criticism of the Abbé Prévost follows, but this is based upon a passage which is not really Prévost's own, having been translated by him from the English of Rowe.[2] Le Blanc continues:

Ophélie, fille de ce seigneur [Polonius], devient folle en apprenant sa mort. Elle est aimée d'Hamlet, mais si peu et d'une façon si singulière que ce n'est pas la peine d'en parler.[3] La malheureuse Ophélie à qui la tête a tourné, vient en différentes scènes pour faire, dire, et chanter mille extravagances.

Having thus disposed of Ophelia to his satisfaction, the Abbé turns to the gravediggers and observes:

Cette scène si vantée par les Anglois entre Hamlet et l'un des fossoyeurs commence par de misérables plaisanteries de la part du fossoyeur et finit du côté d'Hamlet par des lieux communs de morale sur la vanité des hommes et sur l'égalité que la mort rétablit entr'eux; le tout à l'occasion d'une tête de mort que le fossoyeur dit être celle d'un nommé Yorick, un fou du roi, qu'Hamlet dans son enfance a beaucoup connu. Shakespeare étoit un grand génie; mais ce n'est pas dans cette scène que j'en chercherois des preuves.[4]

[1] Le Blanc, II, 292. Contrast the *Bibliothèque britannique* (II, 124), which, after translating the Hamlet monologue "aussi littéralement que nous le pourrons sans être absolument barbares ou inintelligibles," remarks: "Voilà à peu près ce que dit Shakespeare: voici ce que M. de Voltaire lui fait dire" (October–December, 1733). After what Le Blanc had previously said about inadequate translations, he seems here to be overawed by Voltaire.

[2] Cf. my article, "The Abbé Prévost and Shakespeare," in *Modern Philology*, XVII, 198, note.

[3] Contrast Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, London, 1908, pp. 68–69.

[4] This is a stock criticism of the gravedigger scene. Cf. Voltaire, *Lettres phil.* (Lanson ed.), II, 80; Riccoboni, *op. cit.*, p. 128; D'Argens, *op. cit.*, IV, 237; Prévost, *Pour et Contre*, XIV, 66–68.

Le Blanc speaks of Hamlet as moralizing "avec tant d'emphase," translates the speech of the dying Laertes, notes that the stage is left "jonché de corps morts," that the duration of the action is such as to be scarcely exactly known to the author himself, and that "ce poète a fait peu d'ouvrages dont il n'y ait les trois quarts à retrancher." Shakespeare wrote in a barbarous age, it is true, before the French themselves had developed any tragedy at all, but since his time the English have made little progress.

> Si les pièces de leurs auteurs modernes sont plus régulières, elles n'ont pas à beaucoup près les mêmes beautés que celles de Shakespeare.[1] Il a sçu peindre toutes les passions excepté celles de l'amour.[2] S'il révolte par les petitesses qui lui sont familières, il étonne encore davantage par la sublimité de son génie. Avec tous ses défauts, c'est le plus grand poète que les Anglois ayent eu dans la tragédie. Mais est-il bien vrai qu'en cette partie nous devions aujourd'hui même les regarder comme nos maîtres? Est-il bien vrai qu'en quelque genre que ce soit nous ne puissions les égaler?[3]

Thus national pride brings the passage to a close.

References to Henry VIII and to King John occur[4] and there are a few other scattered observations of slighter interest.[5] Volume III contains also a translation of a work known as the *Supplément du génie, ou l'art de composer des poèmes dramatiques tels que l'ont pratiqué plusieurs auteurs célèbres du théâtre anglois*, written by an author "qui est ici en réputation pour le théâtre et que la discrétion ne me permet pas de nommer."[6] The notes seem to be by Le Blanc himself. The text is a satire on English drama, the old sad story of indifference to the unities, the mingling of tragic and comic elements, etc.

In conclusion, what may we say of Le Blanc's treatment of English literature? Pope we find to be treated favorably, but what little is said is without special interest. Addison's *Cato* is praised, a fact which shows that Le Blanc is inclined to look favorably upon

[1] After all, Le Blanc does not really prefer plays like Addison's *Cato*. Cf. *supra*.

[2] By which strange exception must be meant drawing-room love *à la Marivaux* or perhaps *à la Crébillon fils*.

[3] Le Blanc, II, 286–302.

[4] *Ibid.*, III, 168, notes.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 142, note *g*; 161, note *d*; 163, note *a*; 181, note *a*; 189, note *b*.

[6] *Ibid.*, III, 135–95.

drama which is classical in form. Steele's *Conscious Lovers* is mentioned very favorably, but this praise comes lagging along after Prévost's. Swift is praised, but his satirical genius is neither understood nor appreciated. Shaftesbury is esteemed highly as a critic in sympathy with the French spirit. Gay's *Beggars' Opera* is severely censured. Le Blanc considers Richardson's *Pamela* interesting, but long drawn out, a verdict which is probably acceptable to most moderns. Dryden's *All for Love* is praised. Otway and Southerne are called great but are criticized for the mingling of tragic and comic, and Congreve is praised. In general, however, the Restoration period is condemned as to both style and morality. Waller is excepted from this condemnation, and Milton's *Paradise Lost* is praised highly, though considered somewhat lacking in "sagesse" and "goût." Raleigh, Spencer, and Fairfax are mentioned, and attention is called to the influence of the Bible upon English style. Chaucer has been read with interest. In short, all this is very fragmentary criticism, which could have had little influence, but it is interesting as an indication of the sort of impressions a Frenchman like Le Blanc brought back with him from England. Shakespeare is deserving of a more detailed summary.

In his treatment of Shakespeare, Le Blanc has obviously tried to be fair, but his regard for the "bienséances" is too great for him to be able to accept the mingling of tragic and comic elements or to appreciate their significance as a more complete and less artificial portrayal of life. It is that inability in one form or another which constantly prevents him from showing a more complete understanding or admiration of Shakespeare. *Henry VI* has interested him. It is worth noting that he has not overlooked Shakespeare's historical drama, since only two years later (1747) Hénault brought out his *François II*, which was admittedly inspired by Shakespeare's history plays.[1] Of course it is not certain that there is connection between Hénault and Le Blanc, especially since La Place's translations of Shakespeare intervene (1745). However, Le Blanc is at least pointing the way in a new direction, which unfortunately was not soon followed by men of sufficient genius to establish historical drama on the French stage. *Othello*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth*, and *Hamlet* call

[1] H. Lion, *Le Président Hénault* (1903), pp. 236 ff.

forth interesting comments on the part of the Abbé, but on the whole it is more criticism of "faults" than of "beauties." For this, however, there was no lack of precedent in England itself, and this should not be forgotten in estimating French criticism of the period. Not to make further mention of Rymer, Charles Gildon (1665–1724) had remarked that "Shakespeare is indeed stor'd with a great many beauties, but they are in a heap of rubbish."[1] Rowe (1674–1718), however, had expressed the wish that Rymer had not limited his attention to the faults, but had "observ'd some of the beauties too, as I think it became an exact and equal critique to do. It seems strange that he should allow nothing good in the whole."[2] Le Blanc's judgments, as those of a man only moderately gifted, represent better than would those of a man of genius the attitude of the average cultivated public of the time, interested in foreign literature to an increasing extent, willing to treat Shakespeare, while criticizing him, with much the same courtesy they would have used in society, but not extremely enthusiastic as yet and not able to accept the mingling of tragic and comic elements in tragedy. It is noteworthy that Le Blanc, like his predecessors, seems uninterested in Shakespearean comedy. It is not probable that Le Blanc's *Lettres* had great influence. They were too readily absorbed by the great current of interest that was being directed toward England by men of greater abilities than he. However, they do help to furnish a sort of barometer of the attitude of the cultivated French public at the time when the first translation of Shakespeare's works appeared.[3] It is of interest too that many of his letters were addressed to Buffon, La Chaussée, Duclos, Bouhier, Freret, Crébillon père, Crébillon fils, Du Bos, and Montesquieu, as well as to others of lesser prominence.[4] To have brought English literature increasingly to the attention of these men is to have rendered valuable service.

[1] Charles Gildon, *op. cit.*, p. 425.

[2] Rowe, *Introduction to Shakespeare's Works*, I (1709), xxxiv–xxxv.

[3] La Place's partial translation in 1745.

[4] Ninety-two letters in all, addressed as follows: Buffon, 19; La Chaussée, 7; M. H ..., 6; M. le Marquis du T ..., 5; M. l'abbé d'Olivet, 5; M. Du Clos, 5; M. le Chevalier de B ..., 4; M. Freret, 4; M. le Président Bouhier, 4; M. le Marquis de G ..., 3; M. le Duc de Nivernois, 3; M. de Crébillon, 3; M.L.A.H. ..., 3; M. le Marquis de Lomellini, 3; M. l'Abbé Du Bos, 2; M. de Crébillon fils, 2; M. le Duc de C ..., 2; M. l'Abbé Sallier, 2; M. le Comte de C ..., 2; M. l'Abbé L. C ..., 2; M. le Président de Montesquieu 2; M. l'Abbé Gédouin, 1; M. de Montcrif, 1; M. l'Abbé Rothelin, 1; M. de Maupertuis, 1.

Of the style of Shakespeare, Le Blanc had spoken most worthily. He had not failed to note its power and its beauty, the force of Shakespeare's expressions, the vividness and reality of the best scenes, the manner in which the supernatural element was used to grip the spectator and compel his attention. The Abbé had seen too that much of this power was lost in translation and could never be felt by a Frenchman who did not know English. In his objection to frequent changes of scene and the lapse of time, as well as to the scenes of buffoonery, Le Blanc was of his time and of his nation, but it should not be forgotten that even now Shakespeare is scarcely given on the stage without omissions and that some plays where there is greatest violation of the unities are almost impossible of satisfactory presentation before a modern audience. The tendency of modern drama is certainly in the main toward the unities, sanely interpreted, rather than away from them. No one but Shakespeare has to so great a degree been able to be a law unto himself. His success has rather been in spite of his disregard of the unities than because of it. Le Blanc's greatest shortcoming is in not fully sensing the great throbbing human life in Shakespeare's work and seeing that it is this which justifies the methods exemplified in his greatest plays.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

"THE PSALTER OF THE PIG," AN IRISH LEGEND

The following Middle-Irish legend is known to me in five manuscripts: (1) *Book of Fermoy* (*RIA*, p. 54, col. 2, l. 18—p. 56, col. 2, l. 16) with a gap of fifteen lines on page 55. Fifteenth century. Vellum.[1] (2) *23. C. 19* (*RIA*, p. 318, l. 6—p. 321). Written at various times, no part earlier than the late eighteenth century. Paper. (3) *23. M. 47* (*RIA*, Part V, pp. 93–95). Nineteenth century. Paper. (4) *23. M. 50* (*RIA*, p. 154, l. 1—p. 156, l. 6). About 1750. Paper. (5) *24. B. 27* (*RIA*, pp. 292, 294, 296, 298).[2] Nineteenth century. Paper.

A sixth copy, found in the fifteenth-century vellum *Book of Lismore*, has been printed and translated by S. H. O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica* (London and Edinburgh, 1892, I, 87–89; II, 94–96).

The paper manuscripts, though agreeing in general with the version represented by *Lismore*, contain interesting variants and in some instances serve to improve O'Grady's transcript. The text here printed is based on MS *23. C. 19*, the most complete of the paper copies.

The version in the *Book of Fermoy* differs so markedly from that of the other manuscripts as to justify printing separately. The manuscript is badly defaced and in many places is illegible. Whenever possible I have filled the gaps with readings from the *Book of Lismore*.

Caenchomrac, the hero of the *Saltair na muice*, was abbot of Louth, and, according to the Four Masters,[3] died in the year 898: *Caenchomhrac Insi Endoimh, epscop 7 abb Lughmaidh, aitti Aenacain, mac Eccertaigh, 7 Dúnadhaigh, mac Eccertaigh ó ttat Uí Chuinn na*

[1] There is a short account of the tale in Todd's description of the manuscript, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Irish MSS Series*, I, No. 1 (1870), p. 21.

[2] The text is here accompanied by a rough English translation.

[3] *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*, ed., John O'Donovan, I, Dublin, 1856.

mbocht, dég an treas lá fichet Julí, "Caenchomrac of Inis Endaimh, bishop and abbot of Louth, tutor of Aenacan, son of Ecertach, and of Dunadhach, son of Ecertach, from whom are descended the Ui Cuinn na mBocht,[1] died the twenty-third day of July." The Ecertach who figures in our tale as a son of Aedacan, is doubltess a reminiscence of the personage of the same name referred to in the annalistic passage, where Ecertach is the father of Aenacan. The Four Masters record the death of Ecertach at the year 893: *Egertach, airchinnech Eccailsi bicce, athair Aenacáin 7 Dunadhaigh, dég*, "E., archdeacon of *Ecclais bec*, father of A. and D., died." Eogan, represented in the legend as the brother of Ecertach, is perhaps to be identified with an Eogan who appears in a genealogy of Conn na mBocht as the grandfather of Ecertach: *Maolfinden, mac Cuinn [na mBocht], mic Joseph, mic Donnchadha, mic Dunadhaigh, mic Eicceartaigh, mic Luachain, mic Eoghain, mic Aodhagain, mic Torbaigh, mic Gormain, do Uibh Ceallaigh Breagh*, "Maolfinden, son of Conn . . . . son of Ecertach, son of Luachan, son of Eogan . . . . of the O'Kellys of Breagh" (*F.M.*, ad an. 1056). As in the annals, the Eogan of the legend is represented as the son of Aedacan. His death is recorded by the Four Masters at the year 845: *Eoghan .i. angcoire, mac Aedhagáin, mic Torbaigh, ó Cluain mic Nóis, décc*, "Eogan, the anchorite, of Clonmacnoise, son of Aedacan, son of Torbach, died." According to the same authority Aedacan died at Clonmacnoise in the year 834: *Aodhagan mac Torbaigh, abb Lucchmaidh, décc ina ailethre hi cCluain mic Nóis; Eoghan, mac Aedhagáin, ro ansidhe hi cCluain mic Nóis, conadh uadha ro chinset Meic Cuinn na m-bocht innte*, "Aedacan, son of Torbach, abbot of Louth, died on his pilgrimage in Clonmacnoise; Eogan, son of Aedacan, remained in Clonmacnoise and from him are descended the Mac Cuinn na mBocht there." The Hy-Many of the legend is the native district of the O'Kellys.[2] That Eogan should come to be regarded as the brother of his grandson is quite in accord with recognized habits of tradition.

[1] The Conn na mBocht here referred to is identified by Zimmer (*Zt. f. vergl. Sprachforsch.*, XXVIII [1887], 674) with the grandfather of Maolmuire, the scribe of the *Lebor na hUidre*. According to the Four Masters, Conn died in 1059.

[2] John O'Donovan, *The Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many, Commonly Called O'Kelly's Country* (Irish Archaeological Society), Dublin, 1843, pp. 2 ff.; *The Tribes of Ireland*, Dublin, 1852, p. 37, n. 7.

Caenchomrac is referred to in several other early Irish documents. In the *Annals of Ulster* (Ed., Wm. M. Hennessy, I, Dublin, 1887), he is called *episcopus et princeps Lugmaid* and his death is recorded at the year 902. In the *Martyrology of Gorman* (Ed., Whitley Stokes [Henry Bradshaw Society], London, 1895, p. 143) his day is given as July 23, and a gloss adds: *epscop, ó Inish Éndoimh for Loch Ribh. Cain Comrac Innsi Endaimh* is also referred to at July 23 in the *Martyrology of Tallaght* (*Calendar of Irish Saints, the Martyrology of Tallaght*, ed., Matthew Kelly, Dublin, N.D., p. xxx).[1] The *Martyrology of Donegal* contains the following entry at July 30: *Caenchomrac ó Inis Éndaim for Loch Ribh, acus rob epscop é i gCluain meic Nóis ar dtús, do muintir Dega a chénél, acus ro fágaib Cluain ar méd a airmidne innte ár ro adairset na comfhoigsi é amail fháid, co ndechaid d'iarraid uaignesa for Loch Ribh iaram,* "Caenchomrac of Inis Endaim in Loch Ree, who at first was bishop in Clonmacnoise, his kinship was of the *muinter Degha;*[2] and because of the excess of reverence paid him there—for the neighboring people venerated him as a prophet—he left Cluain and went to seek solitude in Loch Ree." (Cf. *Silva Gadelica*, II, 472, 518.][3]

The name Mochta, attached to Caenchomrac in the *Lismore* version of the legend, was borne by several saints in early Ireland. The most famous of these founded the monastery of Louth[4]—a fact which may account for the name being connected with Caenchomrac. He is commemorated at August 19, and his death is recorded by Tigernach (*Revue celtique*, XVII [1896], 134), the *Annals of Ulster*, and the Four Masters at 534.[5] The life of St. Mochta (Maucteus) is given in the *Acta sanctorum* (Boll.), XXXVII

[1] July 23 is also given as his day in the tract *De quibusdam episcopis*, compiled by Duald mac Firbis in 16$\frac{8}{8}$ (*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Irish MSS Series*, I, No. 1, p. 114).

[2] Caenchomrac's family, the *Úi Degha*, is mentioned in the *Book of Leinster* (Facs., 337, *a;* cf. *Silva Gadelica*, II, 472, 518).

[3] The name *Caenchomrac* is common in the Irish monastic records. See, for example, *F.M.*, ad an. 787, 927, 934, 941, 945, 952, 961, 986; *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Irish MSS Series*, I, No. 1, p. 100.

[4] Cf. Alphons Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katolischen Kirche in Irland* (Mainz, 1890), I, 78.

[5] Cf. *Adamnan's Life of St. Columba*, ed., Wm. Reeves, Edinburgh, 1874, p. 248; Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, London, 1905, pp. 309 f.; *Martyrology of Gorman*, ed. cit., p. 161; Rhŷs, *Celtic Folk-Lore Welsh and Manx*, Oxford, II (1901), 545; J. H. Todd, *St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*, Dublin, 1864, pp. 29 ff.

(1867), 745, and in the *Acta sanctorum Hiberniae ex codice Salmaticensi*, ed., de Smedt and de Backer, Edinburgh and London, 1888, pp. 905 ff.[1]

Loch Ri (Ribh), now Loch Ree, an expansion of the Shannon between Athlone and Lanesborough, is famous in Irish history and legend.[2] Its islands appear to have been favorite resorts of Irish monks during the Middle Ages,[3] and during the Norse period they were subject to frequent depredations at the hands of the vikings.[4] According to the *Aidead Echach maic Maireda*, found in *LU*, the lake was formed from the urine of a horse given to Ribh by the fairy king Mider.[5] A monster that dwelt beneath its waters was slain by Finn mac Cumhail (*Transactions of the Ossianic Society*, II, Dublin, 1855, p. 55; VI [1861], 122). The Irish notes to the *Martyrology of Oengus*[6] contain an account of Fuinche the Rough, who was so called because "when they sought to wed her to a husband . . . . she sprang into Lough Erne and passed under water, both fresh water and sea, till she appeared at Inis Clothrann [now Quaker's Island, in Loch Ree] and came to Diarmait,[7] who asked her on what business she was bound. Then she tells him her tales, and thus was she, with shells and sea-slime (*turscair* [var., *trustur*] *muiride*) cleaving to her."

The story of the monastery beneath the lake and of Caenchomrac's sojourn therein appears to be of local origin and, in its present form, is the work of a writer who was acquainted with the monastic tradition represented by the annals. It is more or less closely

[1] There is said to be a life of Mochta in Colgan's *Acta sanctorum*, but this work is not accessible to me in Chicago.

[2] Cf. James Woods, *Annals of Westmeath, Ancient and Modern*, Dublin, 1907, pp. 145, 148 ff.; T. O. Russell, *Beauties and Antiquities of Ireland*, London, 1897, pp. 47 ff.; John O'Donovan, *Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many*, p. 10; *F.M.*, I, p. 557, note f.

[3] *Annals of Clonmacnois*, ed., Denis Murphy, Dublin, 1896, ad an. 547; *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 1901, p. 69. See further Dom Louis Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés celtiques*, Paris, 1911, p. 103, and the works there cited.

[4] Cf. *Annals of Ireland: Three Fragments*, ed., John O'Donovan (Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society), Dublin, 1860, *passim;* Margaret Stokes, *Early Christian Architecture in Ireland*, London, 1878, p. 99. One of the prerogatives of the king of Cruachain was "to have a fleet on Loch Ri" (*Leabhar na g-Ceart*, ed., John O'Donovan [Celtic Society], Dublin, 1847, p. 265). See further James Woods, *op. cit.*, p. 149 f.

[5] *Silva Gadelica*, I, 233 ff.; II, 265 ff. Cf. *Rev. Celt.*, XV (1894), 482 f.

[6] *Martyrology of Oengus: Félire Óengusso*, ed., Whitley Stokes [Henry Bradshaw Society], London, 1905, p. 51.

[7] Patron saint of the island; fl. c. 540. Cf. *Mart. of Oengus*, p. 35; *Mart. of Gorman*, p. 13.

paralleled by many accounts of sunken churches, castles, and cities and of visits made by mortals to the subaqueous world in medieval romance and in modern folk-lore.[1]

Early Celtic tradition is particularly rich in accounts of uncanny swine.[2] One of the oldest and best-known Irish stories is that of the pigs of Derbrenn, which were human beings transformed into animals.[3]

TEXT OF THE *SALTAIR NA MUICE* FROM THE *BOOK OF FERMOY*

Scel Saltrach na Muic annso sis.

Espuc amrai boi hi Cluain maic Nóis, Coenchomrach Indsi Endoim a ain[m]. Do muintir Degad a ceinel, 7 dia oilethri dochuaid . . . . (?)[4] uail. Ba mor tra a airmitin a Cluain, ar [r]ofindadh anti dib nogebadh fochraicc [no pian no-]fuiged, 7 atbeiread raithi reim . . . . [5]nogeibedh báss. An tan ba mor [le]is onoir a Cluain,—oir no-adairsed he amal faith

[1] In addition to the citations enumerated in *Modern Philology*, XII (1915), 603, nn. 2 and 3 (cf. *Modern Philology*, XIII [1916], 731 ff.), see T. C. Croker, *Researches in the South of Ireland*, London, 1824, p. 98; Edward Davies, *Mythology and Rites of the British Druids*, London, 1809, p. 146; Rhŷs, *Celtic Folk-Lore*, I, pp. 74, 191 f., 381 ff.; II, 426 ff. 436 ff.; Arthur C. L. Brown, *Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge*, Boston and London, 1913, pp. 236 ff.; *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* VII (1859), 348; Lady Wilde, *Ancient Legends of Ireland*, rev. ed., London, 1899, p. 248; M. A. Courtney, *Cornish Feasts and Folk-Lore*, Penzance, 1890, pp. 66 ff.; Robert Hunt; *Popular Romances of the West of England*, a new impression, London, 1916, pp. 189 ff., Robert C. Hope, *Legendary Lore of the Holy Wells of England: Including Rivers, Lakes, Fountains, and Springs*, London, 1893, pp. 132, 181; J. F. Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, London, III (1892), 421 ff.; Marie Trevelyan, *Folk-Lore and Folk-Stories of Wales*, London, 1909, pp. 11 ff. Fletcher S. Bassett (*Sea Phantoms: or Legends and Superstitions of the Sea and of Sailors*, Chicago, 1892, p. 480) tells a modern Irish yarn connected with the town of Kilkokeen, which, like the monastery in the *Saltair na muice*, lies beneath the Shannon River. "It was said that, in 1823, a boat's crew of fifteen men were seen in church, who came from this subaqueous village, to receive spiritual consolation. The legend further relates that a ship came into the river one night, and anchored here at the wharves of a fine city. The next morning, one of the inhabitants came aboard, and engaged them to go to Bordeaux; and the day after their return with a rich cargo, the city sank and never reappeared." According to a Shropshire tradition, a monastery once stood on the ground now occupied by Colemere. A spring near the monastery burst forth and overwhelmed it. The chapel bells may still be heard ringing at certain times (C. S. Burne, *Shropshire Folk-Lore*, p. 67). For a church overwhelmed by water and "now represented on dry land only by a hermit in a violent hurry," see *Celtic Review*, III (1906–7), 273. See, further, Paul Sébillot, *Le Folk-Lore des Pêcheurs*, Paris, 1901, p. 359 ff., and Franz Schmarsel, *Literarhistorische Forschungen*, Heft 53, Berlin, 1913, pp. vi–viii (Bibliog.), pp. 62 ff.

[2] Cf. Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, II, 501 ff.; J. A. MacCulloch, *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 209 ff.; see further *Transactions of the Kilkenny Archæological Society*, II, 303 ff.; *Revue celtique*, XV (1894), 475.

[3] *Revue celtique*, XV (1894), 471.

[4] "erb eb" (?) at the end of a line.

[5] "reim" at the end of a line.

—as ed dorinde: teact cu hInis Endaim for Loch Rí di oilit*hri*, ar ba huain leis fri hórt 7 oifrend. Bat*ar tra* drem dia manchaib-sium, 7 no-aithigdis for tír amach ar cend almsan 7 phrimiti fer Tẹabtha, or bát*ar* fir Tethfa a ngeillsine cu mor dosom .i. an c*ét* orc 7 an c*ét* loeg 7 an c*ét* uan 7 bairgen gacha loisti, 7 ni berthi a n-*ár tar* n*ónmor acht* cu mbeitis fa ciss dos*om*, 7 dix*it*:

"Adlochar dom ríg;
fir Tebthai dia tír
ní ragonsat n*ech*,
nír gonad nech dib.

"Atbeirim-si frib,—
ni fa bec an bad—
acht cu luaite mé,
bid nónmor b*ar* n-ar.

"Ocus gid uathad daib," or se, "ocus gid sochaide bess an b*ar* n-aighaid, *acht* cu nderntai m'umrad-sa (?), do soisti slán.

"Nónm*ar* a Tebthai trirg,
roed míli do míl*ib*,
denat Coencomrac d'imrad,
roisid imshl*án* dá rír[ib]."

Do-bid-*sium* it*ir* Cluain 7 Inis Endoim .i. seal . . . .(?)[1] Aroili la n-and dosom an Inis [Endoim] lot*ar* na manaig asin indsi. Lot*ar* Eog[án 7 Ecertach d]á bronndaltai an cl[éirigh] .i. da mhac Aedacáin [d'Íb] Maine, cu rangat*ar* Sliab Liat[r]o[ma a n-Ib Maine]. Din bát*ar* ua Fannain oc seilc gur marbsat traed (?) do mucaib altai. Dorads[at] banb dona cléirchib. Tucsad *tra* na cl[éirig] an banb-sin leo co hInis Endoim. Curset forsin ngabail boi os cind na teined. Tiagait fein for fud na hindsi do gab*ail* a salm. Fagaibt[er] Coencomrac na hen*ar* sin durtaigh. Nir cia[n] do cu faca an scal mor cuice a bun na tuinde. Bendaigis don cl*éirech*. Bendcais an cl*éirech* dos*om*. "Can tanaigais, a chleirig?" or Coenchomrac. "Don tuind-si amuig," ol an fer mor. "Cid tuc sund?" or Coencomrac. "A ndiaid na muice ut," or seisem, 7 tuc a osnaid os airt a carad. "Cred sin?" or Coencomrac. "Ni *hansa*," or se. "Mainist*ir* fil linde san . . . .(?)"[2]

. . . . . .

"[C]red sin?" or Caencomhruc. "Ni *hansa*," or se. "Mainistir fil linne

[1] "m and dib(?)" at the beginning of a line.

[2] MS, "sei" (?) at the end of a line. On the next line the scribe adds: Don leitsi amuig don duilleoig ata in cuid eli don scel-s[o]: The rest of this story is overleaf. The remainder of the column is occupied by a memorandum. Cf. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Irish MSS Series*, I, No. 1, p. 21. The tale is continued in a different hand on p. 56.

fón loch-sa anois, 7 doronsad macaim na mainistreich . . . .[1] [im]marbaidh cor cu[i]red amach iat hi rachtaib muc, 7 is iat do marbadh hi sleib Liaththroma, 7 is aen dibside inti fil forsan ngabail ugud, 7 is meisi a athair collaide ón, 7 ac so duid sunn a shaltair am' laim-si, 7 dobeirim duid-si hi, a C[h]aencomhruic, ar n-aentadh 7 for anmuin inti diar rofoghain cusaniugh, or da maradh budhein e, is maith doregerudh in sthalm gabail." Saltair na Muice alberthai fria iarsin, 7 romair si fri ciana iarsin hi Cluain mac Nois. An banbh adberthae fri hEoghan 7 ba he-sin in banbh re . . . . oel (?)[2] tuirc. Cedaigis in cleirich don fhir moir (?) a mhac do breith lais dia adhnacul. Faemais. "[Ci]d duit, a Chaenchomraic, gan techt limsa do fheg[a]dh na mainisdrech?" Lodar diblínaib fon loch [issi]n mainistir. Tic Caencomrac on tráth go roile [i]nte oc urd 7 oc oiffrind. Machtnaighidh [in n-in]adh (?) 7 a haine. "Ni hannsa la Dia," ol in cléirech, "[ar n-aitr]eb fo uisci ínas isna hinadaib ele." [Ocus tic] Caencomrac iarnabaruch dia thigh 7 se [lán] do urscur in locha, 7 no-athaighed [. . . . c]o minic don mainisdir-sin in cen [do m]air (?) Ní bidh dichleith fair ínte [o sin am]ach.

Teighdis iarum cléirigh Locha Ri g[ach Di]ardain Cásc do Inis Endoimh do [shaigidh Chae]nchomraic ar daigh ola do coisercadh. [Dogní]dh-sum tra ort ocus oifrinn 7 co[. . . . proic]ept gacha Diardain Casc. [Ba gnathr f]leadugad issin lo sin iar n-urd [7 iar n-aifreann. Doberar]iarum linn 7 biadh dona cl[éirchib amail doberth]ad(?) dogres. Luidh Caencom[rac uaithib im]ach combai irmhor in lae ina n-egmais. Tig dia saigidh iarum 7 iad ag praindiugud. Bennachais doib; bennachsat-sumh dosumh on mudh cedna. Docí tra na mísa lán do shaill occa . . . .[3] oca tomailt ga baidh for a cairiugud im tomhailt na sailli isin Co[r]gus co tard cursugud mór forro, 7 rogab ferc 7 lonnus mor é, curfas bruth dermhair air conar fedsat fegadh in aghaidh la ruithnem na diachta bai in a ghnuis. Teit Caencomrac uatha amach iarsin 7 ni facus riam asa haithli, 7 ni feass in fo an loch dochuaidh do aitreab isin mainistir do scarudh fri cleasrudh in thsaeghail 7 na clĕirech no in aingil rostogaib docum nime, 7 nir chaitset sruithe na nGaideal feoil issin Chaplait osin amach.

Fin[it].

TRANSLATION

The Tale of the Psalter of the Pig here.

There was a noble bishop in Clonmacnoise; Caenchomrac of Inis Endaim was his name, his kinship was of the *muinter Dega*. And on his pilgrimage he went [to Clonmacnoise . . . . ?]. Great then was the

[1] Erasure in MS.

[2] "oel(?)" at the beginning of a line. Read "beol" as in *Lis?*

[3] Erasure in MS.

reverence paid him in Cluain; for he would learn whether any one of them should have reward or punishment, and he would tell the quarter of the year . . . . in which he should die. When the honor paid him at Clonmacnoise became too great in his eyes,—for they revered him as a prophet —what he did was to go to Inis Endaim in Loch Ree for a pilgrimage, because in that place he thought there was leisure enough for performing the canonical order and for mass.

[With him] there was a company of his monks, and they used to go out upon the mainland for the alms and first-fruits of the men of Teffia.[1] For the men of Teffia were greatly in submission to him: to wit, the first pigling and the first calf and the first lamb and a loaf for every kneading trough; and their slain should not be more than nine provided they were under *cess* to him.[2] And he said:

"I give thanks to my King!
The men of Teffia, for their land
They have slain no one (?);
None of them has been slain.

"I say unto you,—
Not small the friendship—
Provided only you invoke me,
Your slain shall be nine.

"And though there be few of you," said he, "and though there be a multitude opposed to you, provided only you think of me (?), you shall reach safety.

"Nine men out of melodious Teffia
Against (?) a hundred thousand of thousands,—
Let them think on Caenchomrac;
Verily they shall reach safety."

For a while he dwelt between Cluain and Inis Endaim, first in one, then in the other (?). One day, while he was in Inis [Endaim], the monks went out of the island. There went Eogan [and Ecertach], two dear disciples of the cleric, the two sons of Aedacan of [Hy-]Many, till they reached Slieve Leitrim [in Hy-Many]. There the Ui Fannain were, hunting, and they killed a number (?) of wild pigs. They gave a pigling to the clerics.

[1] A district comprising parts of the present counties of Westmeath and Longford. John O'Donovan, *The Topographical Poems of John O'Dubhagain*, etc. (Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society), Dublin, 1862, notes, p. ix. Cf. *Revue celtique*, XVI (1895), 80.

[2] An Irish life of St. Grellan, the patron saint of the Hy-Maine, gives *gach ced arc is gac ced uan* (every firstling pig and every firstling lamb) as part of the tribute paid by the tribe to Grellan. (O'Donovan, *Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many*, p. 13.) *E singulis Manachiæ domibus patroni sui S. Grillani successoribus tres denarii quotannis, primus porculus, primus agnus, et primus equinus, deferebantur.* (Lynch, *Cambrensis Eversus*, ed., Kelly, II, 508.

Then the clerics carried the pigling with them to Inis Endaim. They placed it on the fork that was over the fire. They on their part go about the island to chant their psalms. Caenchomrac is left alone in the oratory. He was not long so till he saw a great phantom coming toward him out the bottom of the water. [The phantom] saluted the cleric; the cleric saluted him. "Whence hast thou come, O cleric?" said Caenchomrac. "Out of the water," said the big man. "What brought thee here?" said Caenchomrac. "[I have come] for the pig yonder," said the former, and sighed . . . . (?). "What's that?" said Caenchomrac. "Not hard to answer," said he. "We have a monastery in the . . . . (?)."[1]

. . . . . .

"What's that?" said Caenchomrac. "Not hard to answer," said he. "We have a monastery under this lake now. And the young men of the monastery committed sin, so that they have been put out in the form of pigs, and it is they who were killed in Slieve Leitrim. And one of them is he on the fork yonder, and I am his mortal father. And here is his psalter in my hand, and to thee I give it, O Caenchomrac, ... (?)[2] of our union and for the soul of the person whom it served until to-day, for if he himself now lived, it is well he would have arranged the psalm-singing." Thereafter it was called the Psalter of the Pig, and it remained for a long time in Clonmacnoise. Eogan was called *in Banbh*, for he was the pigling with a boar's mouth(?). The cleric permitted the big man to take his son with him to bury him. He consented. "Why not come with me, O Caenchomrac, to see the monastery?" They went together under the lake into the monastery. Caenchomrac remains in it from one canonical hour till the corresponding one next day performing canonical service and mass. He wonders at the place (?) and its delightfulness. "It is as easy for God," said the cleric, "[to cause us to dwell (lit., our dwelling)] under water as in other places." [And] on the morrow Caenchomrac [goes] home, and he [covered with] lake wrack.[3] And he used often to visit that monastery as long as he lived (?); nothing was hidden from him therein from that time forth.

Afterwards the clerics of Loch Ree used to go every Easter Thursday to Inis Endaim to [visit] Caenchomrac that he might consecrate oil for them. He used to celebrate canonical service and mass and . . . . preaching every Easter Thursday. A banquet [was usual] on that day after the celebration of the hours [and mass]. Thereupon food and drink [is given] to the clerics [as it was always given (?)]. Caenchomrac went out [from them] and was absent from them during the greater part of the day Thereafter he comes to them while they were at meat. He greeted them; they

[1] For the gap, see p. 448, n. 2, above.

[2] Though no gap is apparent at this point in the manuscript, something seems to be missing.

[3] Compare Fuinche's condition in the story given above, p. 446.

greeted him in the same manner. Then he sees the platters full of bacon, and them eating it. Thereupon he took to chiding them for eating the bacon in Lent, and he reproved them severely. And great anger and indignation seized him so that his wrath increased mightily, and they could not look him in the face because of the brilliance of the godliness in his countenance. Then Caenchomrac goes out from them, and he was never seen afterwards. And it is not known whether he went to dwell under the lake in the monastery so as to shut himself off from the reveling of the world and of the clerics or whether the angels took him up to Heaven. And from that time forth the wise ones of the Gael have never eaten flesh on Maunday Thursday.[1]

TEXT OF THE *SALTAIR NA MUICE* FROM THE MODERN MANUSCRIPTS

Easpuc[2] uasal rábái i Cl*uain* maic Nóis, Caon Comrac a ainm 7 Mochta a ainm ar tús. Mac oighi hé 7 comharba De, 7 da oilithri doch*uaidh* co Cl*uain* maic Nóis. Ba mor tra[3] a airmitin 7 a[4] chadhus i Cl*uain*, aro fin*nad*[5] o Dia gac æn dibh no gheab*ed* bás in fuighb*ed* fochraic no in fuigh[*b*]*edh* pian, 7 no indis*edh* do chách in bhli*adhain* do gheib*edh* b*ás* in ráithi de*ádh*nach d*on* bhl*iadain* a imt[h]us. Ba mór lais iar*um* a[6] airmhitin i Cl*uain*, 7 táinic co hInnis Eandaimh for Loch Ri a ailithre do dh*eadn*amh[7] innti, ar ba huaignech[8] leis hí fria hórd 7 aifreann 7 írn*aigh*thi.

Bhatar dream úrn*aigh*thec do mhanch*aib* na fharradh ínnte, 7 no théightis for tír immach air ceann almsain 7 primhidin i Teathbha, ar do bhatar fir Theabhtha i n-geillsine mhóir dho .i. *céad* arc 7 *céad* lægh 7 *céad*

[1] Cf. Whitley Stokes, *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore* (Anec. Oxon.), Oxford, 1890, *s.v. caplait* in Index. On the consecration of oil, the feast (in commemoration of the Last Supper), and other ceremonies of Maunday Thursday (the fifth day of Holy Week), see Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain*, ed., W. C. Hazlitt, I (London, 1870), p. 84; K. A. H. Kellner, *Heortology, a History of the Christian Festivals from Their Origin to the Present Day*, London, 1908, p. 72; G. Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* (Sammlung von Lehrbüchern der praktischen Theologie), I (Berlin, 1900), 197. On the severity of the Lenten Rule in Celtic monasteries, see F. E. Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, Oxford, 1881, p. 146.

[2] *23. C. 19* lacks title. *24. B. 27*, "Sgeal air Loch Ri"; *23. M. 47*, "Psaltair na Muice annso"; *23. M. 50*, "Saltair na Muice annso." O'Grady's text is headed: "Imthecht Caenchomraic."

[3] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "trath."

[4] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50* omit.

[5] *24. B. 27*, "arna fionnad"; *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "ara fionnadh."

[6] Omitted in *23. M. 50*.

[7] *23. C. 19*, "7 a ailith*re* do dheadnamh"; *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "do déanamh a oilithre."

[8] *23. C. 19*, "huaingec."

uan[1] 7 bairghíon gacha loisdi 7 screapal gacha caithr*each*, 7 nac rachadh a n-ar dar nonbar acht co mb*éid*is fo screap*al* dos*am*, am*ail* isbert:

"Atlocar[2] dom rígh;
fir Teabhtha dia tír,
ní ró ghonsat neach,
gonad neach díbh.[3]

"Adeirim-si fribh,—
ní ba br*ec* in bádh,[4]—
mad[5] luatte me,
bid n*onbur* b*ar* n-ár.

"7 d*eirim* fr*ib*-se,[6] gid soch*aidi* bes in *bar* tograim, giamba huath*adh* *doibh*, *acht* co nder[n]tai m'imrath-sa, ragthai slan," dia n-eb*ert*:[7]

"N*onbur* a Teabhtha[8] thiri,
fr*i*[9] *cét* m*ile* dh*o* mil*ib*,
denat Cæncomrac dh'imradh,
ragh*at* imshl*an* dia tíribh.[10]

"Ní b*er*at buidhine a mbuadha
dh*o* shl*uaga* dom*on* cia,
acht co mb*iad*[11] cum fhoghn*adh*-sa,
is am[12] fhoghn*a*dh dh*o* Dhia."

Dobhí-siam[13] aml*aidh* sin idir Chl*uain* 7 Inis Endaimh seal. Fea*cht* dia mbúi in Inis Endaimh, lotar na man*aigh* immach. Luid Eog*án* 7 Eicertach, dá mac Ædhacain[14] d'Ibh Maine, dá bron[n]*dh*alth*adh* in chl*éir*igh co ránncatar sliabh Liatroma a n-Ib Maine. Is ann batar I Fannain[15] oc seilg isin

[1] "cead arc—uan": *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "cēad ūan 7 cēad ōrc 7 *cēad* laodh." For "orc" *24. B. 27* reads: "torc."

[2] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50* omit this and the following stanza.

[3] For the last two lines *Lis.* has:
"nír gonadh nech dhibh,
ní ro gonsat nech."

[4] *Lis.*, "bāgh."

[5] *Lis.* adds "dia."

[6] 7—"frib-se": *Lis.*, "Ocus dono for sé."

[7] 7 deirim—"n-ebert": omitted in *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*.

[8] *23. C. 19*, "Teadbha (?)."

[9] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*., and *23. M. 50*, "fria."

[10] "dia tíribh": *24. B. 27*, "do riribh"; *Lis.*, "dia tirib"; *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "dá ríribh."

[11] *23. M. 47*, "mbéara"; *23. M. 50*, "mbearadh(?)."

[12] Omitted in *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*; *Lis.*, "m'."

[13] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "Dobhi."

[14] *24. B. 27*, *23. C. 19*, "Ædhacán"; *Lis.*, "Aedhacán."

[15] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "Flainn."

tsleibh. [7] ro mharbsat[1] drecht do mhucuibh all*tha* ann,[2] 7 do radsat bandh do na clérch*ibh* dhibh, 7 tucsat leo dia tigh é 7 ró chuirset for sin ngabáil i cind na tein*edh*. 7 mar dobhí in cleireach a gab*ail* a shalm co fac*aidh* in fer mor chuici ó bh*un* na tuinne asin loch. B*eann*achais don chl*eir*ech 7 b*eann*achus in cl*eir*ech dosum. "Is maith (ar se) na freicear*adh*[3] in tí atá forsin ng[a]bháil i cind na tein*edh* thu, 7 na ghebhadh[4] salma leat.[5] "Cr*ead* sin itir ón?"[6] ar Cæncomrac. "N*insa* (air se). Mainistir fil lindi fón loc*h*-so thios, ar ni dailghi lasin ccoimhdhi áitribh daine fó na hu[i]scibh[7] ina isna hindad*aibh* aili; 7 do ronsat macaeimh na mannaistreach imarbhus co ro chuirit imach i richt muc 7 corab iat[8] ro marb*adh* aniugh i sl*iabh* Liatroma, 7 aen dibh sin intí fil for sin ngabhail i cinn na tein*edh*, 7 is misi a ath*ar* coll*aidhe*, 7 ac so a shaltar am laimh, 7 doberim duit si í.[9] Saltair na nuici atberthi fria i*arum*, 7 romhair[10] fri ré fada i Cl*uain* mac N*ois*. In bandh dono at berthi fri hEog*an* 7 b*adh* hesin in banbh fri béol tuirc. 7[11] c*eadai*dus Cæncomhrac dosom a bhreith[12] leis dia adhnacul. "Cidh duit, a chleirigh (ar se) nac tice limsa d'féghad na man*nistreach* itá fon loch so shíos?"[13] "Ragat" (ar Cænc*omrac*). Lotar in dís fon loc*h* 7 tiagat isin mainn*isdir* 7 tic Cæncomrac on tráth co araili innte, 7 tic arnabhárach[14] da tigh 7 sé lán do thruscur in locha. 7 do tath*aid*[edh] co minic fon loch, 7 ní bídh dicleidh do uirre o sin imach cein ba beao.

Tictis cleirigh Locha Rí gach Dardain Cásc co hInis Ėndoim do shaig*idh* Cænc*omraic* fo daigin[15] ola do choisrecadh[16] dhóibh 7 do ghnídh[17] som árd 7 aifreann, 7 coisrec*adh*[18] ola 7 próiceapt dóibh. Ba gnáth fleagh*achus*[19] isin lo sin iar n-*ord* 7 iar n-aifreann. Dob*erar*[20] i*arum* linn 7 bia dona cl*eir*ch*ib*

[1] *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "7 ro mharbhud."

[2] "ro mharbsat—ann": omitted in *24. B. 27*. "alltha ann": *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "allta san tsiliabh"; *Lis.*, "allaid ann."

[3] *24. B. 27*, "ro freagradh"; *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "no freagr*adh*."

[4] *24. B. 27*, "ro ghebhadh"; *23. M. 47*, "ro geabhadh"; *23. M. 50*, "no geabhadh."

[5] *23. M. 47*, "riot."

[6] "itir on"; *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50* omit.

[7] *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "huisgidhibh."

[8] "corab iat": *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "gurb*adh* iadh."

[9] "duit si í": *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "si dhuit í."

[10] *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "ro marbh (l)."

[11] "In bandh dono—tuirc 7": omitted in *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*.

[12] "a bhreith": *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "an bhanbh do bhreith."

[13] "so shíos": *23. C. 19*, "fa thios." *Lis.*, "sa tís."

[14] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "arabárach."

[15] *23. C. 19* and *24. B. 27*, "daingin."

[16] "ola do choisrecadh": *23. M. 50; 23. C. 19*, "ola coisraca"; *24. B. 27*, "ola choisraca"; *Lis.*, "ola do choisercadh."

[17] "do ghnidh"; *23. M. 47*, "do ni."

[18] *Lis.*, "coisercadh."

[19] *Lis.*, "fledhugad."

[20] *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "doberthar."

am*al* do-berthí do ghrés. Luidh Cænc*omrac* uaith*ibh* imach 7 tic[1] urmhór in lai na n-ecmus, 7 tic[2] dia saighit[3] iar sin isin tec i mbátar ic proin*niughadh*, 7 beanachus doíbh 7 b*eanaighid*[4] dosum o'n[5] modh *céadna*. Atchi na miasa lan do shaill aca ica[6] tomuilt 7 gabhus for[7] a *cairiugad*[8] im thomuilt na s*aille* isin Cargha[i]s, 7 dorat cursach*ad* mór forra, 7 róghabh ferg 7 lonnus dermair e conár fh*ed*sat féghad na aigidh fri ruithn*each* na diadh*acht*a bui in a ghn*ú*[i]s. Teithit[9] na cléiricc roimhe 7 ronghab crith 7 omhan in shæil*achta*.[10] Teait[11] Cænc*omrac* immach uatha[12] 7 ní fhacus[13] ó sin ille. 7 ni feas in fón[14] loch doch*uaidh* do áitreabh isin mainisdir do[15] fhoghnamh do Dhia 7 do dh*ea*dhdháine fri forbannuibh arsata,[16] no an[17] aingil rucsat a anam[18] dochum nimhe. 7 nír chaithsiat sruithi Gæidal feóil Charghais dá[19] aithle sin.

[1] *Leg.* "tuc" (cf. *Silva Gadelica* I, 89).

[2] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "tigeadh."

[3] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "theigh."

[4] *23. C. 19*, adds "Caoncomrach." For "beanaighid" *Lis.* reads "bennachais cach."

[5] *23. M. 47* and *23. M. 50*, "ar an."

[6] *24. B. 27*, "ag."

[7] *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "ag."

[8] *24. B. 27*, "ccairtíughadh."

[9] *23. M. 47*, "teithe"; *Lis.*, "teichit."

[10] "in shaeil*achta*": *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "do faol*achta*."

[11] "crith—Teait": omitted in *Lis.*

[12] *23. C. 19*, "uath"; omitted in *24. B. 27*.

[13] "ni fhacus": *23. C. 19*, "fhacthus"; *24. B. 27*, "fhacus."

[14] *Lis.*, "fo."

[15] *Lis.*, "co."

[16] "do d*hea*dhdháine—arsata": *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "do scarthan fhria claoindeacraibh daoinne"; *Lis.*, "do . . . . ocus fri forbannuibh ársata."

[17] Omitted in *23. C. 19*.

[18] *23. M. 50*, "ainm."

[19] "Charghais dá": *24. B. 27*, *23. M. 47*, and *23. M. 50*, "san Caplait na."

Tom Peete Cross

University of Chicago

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *January 1921* NUMBER 9

THE MIDLAND PRESENT PLURAL INDICATIVE ENDING *-e(n)*

On the side of form, the present plural indicative ending *-e(n)* is probably the most marked single characteristic of the Midland dialect. It is, accordingly, of sufficient importance to justify an effort both to determine precisely its earliest currency and to consider carefully the problem of its origin.

A precise determination of the occurrence of this termination in the Earliest Middle English material of Midland provenience—the later entries and interpolations in the *Peterborough Chronicle*—has not been made either in Meyer's[1] study of the language of these sections or in the glossary of Plummer's generally admirable edition of the *Chronicles*.[2] The significant forms occur in the specifically Peterborough insertions made by the first scribe, who wrote apparently in 1121, in the contemporaneous entry for 1127, and in the entry for 1137, which was not made before 1154.[3]

In the insertions made in 1121 there are six forms in *-n* which both Plummer in his glossary and Meyer consider present plural indicatives.[4] In addition Plummer properly glosses as indicative

[1] H. Meyer, *Zur Sprache der jüngeren Teile der Chronik von Peterborough* (Jena, 1889).

[2] Charles Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, etc., 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892, 1899).

[3] Concerning the scribes of this chronicle see Plummer, Vol. II, Introduction, pp. xxxv and xlvii. Concerning the Peterborough insertions in the earlier annals see Plummer, Vol. II, Introduction, p. xlv and n. 1, and Meyer, Vorwort, pp. iv–v.

[4] The forms as they appear in Plummer's text are *liggen*, p. 30, l. 36; *liggan*, p. 31, l. 2; *louien*, p. 32, l. 10; *hauen*, p. 36, l. 6; *lin*, p. 116, ll. 11, 21. The forms given by Meyer are listed on pp. 80, 83–84, 104 of his study.

geornon, which Meyer lists as optative, and *be* (with loss of final *n*), which Meyer does not enter at all. The former is under the year 656 (Plummer, p. 33, l. 12), and the latter under the year 675 (Plummer, p. 37, 1. 24). Both are in simple relative clauses which do not express any idea of contingency and in which normal syntax clearly requires the indicative. In these entries by the first scribe is a plural in-*ð* (*liggeð*), *anno* 656, which both Plummer and Meyer enter. In this same annal is a plural *seiþ* (Plummer, p. 33, l. 6), which Plummer glosses correctly but which Meyer does not record—"Swa beo hit, seiþ alle. Amen." Under 675 (Plummer, p. 37, l. 18) is a *liggeð* which Meyer incorrectly enters as plural and which in Plummer's glossary is merely included with others as "pres. sg. & pl." That it is singular is apparent from the text: "Nu gife ic S͂e Peter . . . . þas landes ↄ eal þ þær to liggeð." Both the actual plurals in-*þ*(*ð*) occur in accounts of grants of land to the monastery of Peterborough, and their archaic form may thus very well have been copied or imitated from earlier genuine or spurious documents.

To make clear the situation in the annal for 1127, the quotation of two brief passages is necessary. The chronicler, in characterizing a disreputable Abbot Henry, compares him to a drone in a hive of bees: "Þær he wunede eall riht swa drane doð on hiue. Eall þ þa beon dragen toward, swa frett þa drane ↄ dragað fraward." Somewhat later, as preliminary to an account of this abbot's intimacy with fiends, the chronicler asseverates: "Ne þince man na sellice þ we soð seggen, for hit was ful cuð ofer eall land þ," etc. Meyer enters both *dragen* and *seggen* as plural indicatives, *doð* as singular, is doubtful about *dragað*,[1] and does not enter *frett* at all. Plummer, on the contrary, glosses *dragen* and *seggen* as subjunctive, and *doð*, *dragað*, and *frett* (which he considers miswritten for *fretað*) as plurals. There is, however, no syntactic warrant for regarding *dragen* and *seggen* as anything but indicatives. The evidence, too, is that *doð*, *dragað*, and *frett* are singulars. In the first place, the sense demands the singular: in the statement "Þær he wunede eall riht swa drane doð on hiue," the abbot would almost certainly be compared to a single drone. If this is true, there is

[1] He lists *dragað* (p. 80) among singular forms, but adds "fraglich, ob. sg., könnte auch als 3 pl. aufgefasst werden, da das Subject dazu (*þa drane*) vielleicht als Plural anzusehen ist."

certainly no occasion for a change to the plural in "swa frett þa drane ɔ dragað fraward." Secondly, there is nothing in any of these forms to prevent their being considered singulars. In the interpolated entry for 675 is an unquestioned singular *doð;* a singular in *-að* (*singað*)[1] occurs in the very entry for 1127; and *frett* has very much more the appearance of a syncopated third person singular (other examples of which are noted by Meyer, pp. 80 and 83) than of a miswritten plural *fretað*. Nor need *þa drane* be regarded as a plural form. Several instances of *þa* as singular occur in this same entry for 1127—"ða eorles sunu," "in þa tune," "fram þa selva tune"—and the final *-e* of *drane* does not necessarily denote plurality, as other originally long-stemmed feminine nouns show the extension of this termination to the nominative singular.[2] The evidence is strong that the forms in-*ð* (*t*) are singular and those in *-en* plural indicative.

The annal for 1137 contains two forms in *-en*[3] which both Meyer and Plummer enter as present plural indicatives and no forms in *ð*(*þ*) which either regards as plurals.

In addition to the clearly indicative forms in *-n* that I have cited from the interpolations by the first scribe, there are several others that Meyer lists doubtfully as optatives and that Plummer glosses as subjunctives.[4] Though it is quite possible to construe them as indicatives—in the same annals there are unmistakably singular indicatives in *-ð* in passages very similar to those containing these plurals in *-n*—yet without the inclusion of forms at all doubtful the evidence is ample as to usage in the Peterborough dialect. One scribe writing in 1121 employed eight present plural indicative forms in *-n* as compared with only two in *-ð*(*þ*), and even these two may well have been copied or imitated from earlier originals; a second about 1127 used two forms in *-n* and none in *-ð*(*þ*); and a third, writing probably about 1154, also used two plurals in *-n* and none in *-ð*(*þ*). It is evident that in this section of Midland, by the middle

[1] "Gif hwa hit doð," Plummer, p. 37, l. 23; "man singað," p. 258, l. 7.

[2] Plummer, p. 29, l. 14—*þeode;* p. 37, ll. 26, 29—*witnesse.*

[3] Both are on p. 265 of Plummer's text: *lien*, l. 21, and *willen*, l. 30.

[4] They include three occurrences of *willen* (*wilen*), all in the entry for 656, in Plummer's text, p. 31, ll. 21, 29, 30; *ofbreke* and *healden, anno* 675, p. 31, l. 21; and *tobrœcon* and *healdon, anno* 963, p. 117, ll. 16, 17.

of the twelfth century, the newer present plural indicative termination in *-n* had come into currency, and had supplanted the older corresponding ending in *-ð(þ)*.

Though this termination had thus clearly come into currency at the very beginning of the Middle English period, its use cannot, I believe, be traced back into Old English, into Mercian—in general the Old English correspondent to Midland.[1] E. M. Brown, however, in his study of the language of *Rushworth*[1] presents apparent evidence to the contrary in several forms which he is inclined to consider "early examples of the 'extension' of *-en* to the pres. ind. pl."[2] Unquestionably the verb forms in *-e(n)*, *-a(n)* cited by Brown would be present plural indicatives in normal syntax; but *Rushworth*[1] presents such anomalies in form and syntax that conclusions as to actual usage cannot be properly based upon exceptional forms found in this text. Though the glosser's general practice indicates clearly that he felt the distinction between indicative and optative, he occasionally employed one for the other.[3] Somewhat frequently he used the plural for the singular, and in at least one instance the preterite for the present.[4] Nor is this confusion confined to mood or tense

[1] The significant Mercian material is scant. The early documents—the earliest glosses and the *Vespasian Psalter*—date so far before any unsettling of the Old English grammatical system that they are serviceless on this point. The chief late Mercian document, from the second half of the tenth century, is the interlinear gloss known as *Rushworth*[1], which extends through the Gospel of Matthew and into the fifteenth verse of the second chapter of Mark. Though a gloss, it has much the character of continuous discourse. It has a considerable intermixture of Saxon and Northumbrian forms. There is also an interlinear gloss of a few short Latin pieces, the *Royal Glosses*, dating from about the year 1000. Finally, there is a *Life of St. Chad*, a late text, which is preserved only in a twelfth-century copy by a Southern scribe. The copy is apparently a fairly exact reproduction of the original, though it shows some degree of Southern influence. For bibliographical data on these late Mercian documents see K. D. Bülbring, *Altenglisches Elementarbuch*, Teil I, sec. 25 (Heidelberg, 1902), and the references indicated there. For *Rushworth*[1] there should be added to these the second part of E. M. Brown's study *The Language of the Rushworth Gloss*, etc. (Göttingen, 1892); Uno Lindelöf's *Die Südnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts: die Sprache der sog. Glosse Rushworth*[2], secs. 4–7 (Bonn, 1901); and E. Schulte's *Untersuchung der Beziehung der ae. Matthäusglosse im Rushworth Manuscript zu dem lateinischen Text der Handschrift* (Bonn, 1903).

[2] See Brown, *Language*, Part II, pp. 40–44.

[3] For singular present optatives used instead of indicatives, see Skeat's text, 5:22; 5:29; 5:30; 10:39; 16:25; 18:19; 25:29; 27:43. For indicatives instead of optatives, see 5:25; 5:34; 15:32; 23:15; 24:16, 17, 18; 27:64.

[4] Examples of the plural for the singular are in 2:22; 6:23; 20:2; 23:23; 25:15; the preterite is used for the present in 21:21.

forms; even a cursory examination shows a great number of errors that are purely capricious, without possible relation to grammar, and thus of no consequence in linguistic history.[1]

Many of the errors and anomalies in *Rushworth*[1] are probably due to the method employed in composing it. E. Schulte[2] has shown that *Rushworth*[1] was not based directly on the Rushworth Latin text, which is of mixed Irish character, but that it had as supplementary original a pure Vulgate text; in some instances it followed the reading of one, in some that of the other, and in some it combined the readings of both. Schulte refutes the possible theory that *Rushworth*[1] was merely a translation of a Latin original midway in character between Rushworth and the Vulgate, or that it was the copy of a gloss made from such an original, and he concludes that the glosser, Farman, while glossing Rushworth, must have had before him a second Latin manuscript of pure Vulgate type. The most reasonable explanation of this procedure is that the second manuscript contained an English gloss. Farman's task, then, probably was not so much translation as adaptation of this Old English gloss of a Vulgate text to his mixed Irish Rushworth text, the two differing in innumerable details. Schulte also suggests that this presumptive Old English gloss of the

[1] I list some representative instances. Frequently an *-n-* is inserted, as in 4:25, *fylgendun* for *fylgėdun* ("secutae sunt"); 6:13 *constungae* for *costungae*. In 8:12 an inserted *-n-* changes the form of a participle *aworpene* into that of the gerundive, and similarly in 20:24, 21:15, 24:49, 27:38, 44. Impossible syntactic combinations are numerous: in 1:17, "Omnes igitur generationes ab abraham usque ad dauid sunt xiiii" becomes "Ealra cuþlice kneorissum from abrahame oþ to dauide feowertene kneorisse sint"; 4:6, "in omnibus uis tuis"—"in allum weogas þine"; 10:1, "dedit eis potestatem spirituum immundorum"—"salde heom mæhtae gastas unclenra"; 25:37, "Tunc respondebunt ei iusti"—"Þonne ℑ swærigaþ him þæm soþfæste." In at least one instance a Latin word, instead of being translated, is incorporated into the English gloss: 24:49, "et coepit percuterit [*sic* for *percutere*] conseruos suos et manducat et bibet cum ebris"—"onginnaþ slan efnþeu his manducat him þonne ℑ drinceþ mid druncennum." At times error results apparently from a subconscious imitation of a Latin form, as in the pronouns of the following passages: 5:16, "glorificent patrem uestrum"—"wuldrigæ fæder eowrum"; 8:21, "permitte me. . . . . sepelire patrem meum"—"læt me . . . . bebyrgen fæder minum." Sometimes one form is used for another quite different in function, as *oþþe* for *oþ* in 1:17, where *usque ad* is twice rendered *oþþe to*, and similarly in 18:21. Finally, the glosser regularly misinterprets the Latin adjective *nequam*, with the result that the passage in which it occurs is rendered into unintelligible nonsense, as in 6:23, "Si autem oculus tuus nequam est totum corpus tuum tenebrosum erit"—"Gif þin ege ne biþ nan eall þin lichoma beoþ ðeostru." In 13:38 *nequam* is rendered by *nænegu* and in 20:15 by *nawiht*. The errors listed here are of course merely representative and form but a very small proportion of the whole number to be found in *Rushworth*[1].

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 9–23.

Vulgate was in a Saxon dialect, and he thus provides the most satisfactory explanation of the presence of Saxon forms in *Rushworth*[1].[1]

Exceptional forms in a gloss like *Rushworth*[1], composite in structure and abounding in capricious errors and impossible syntactic combinations, provide no basis on which to found conclusions as to actual usage. The occasional occurrence in this text of forms in *-e(n)*, *-a(n)* where normal syntax requires the present plural indicative, accordingly, cannot be regarded as evidence that the later distinctive Midland termination had already come into use at the time this gloss was composed. The significant material in the other late Mercian texts is very scant, but what there is points clearly to the persistence of the earlier termination in *-þ(ð)*. In the *Royal Glosses* are only four instances of the present plural indicative—one an uncompleted *forgef* and the other three ending in *ð(þ)*. In the *Life of St. Chad* are eight present plural indicatives in *-ð(þ)*, in addition to a single *beoð*, and there is none in *-en*. Trustworthy evidence is thus lacking for the use of the ending in question in Mercian texts of the Old English period; the earliest certain instances are those in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

The accepted explanations of the origin of this characteristic Midland ending are that it was transferred into the present indicative plural from the present optative plural,[2] or that it made its way into the present plural indicative through the analogy of the plural forms of the present optative and the preterite indicative and optative.[3] These explanations have been generally accepted, apparently not because investigation has shown them to be well grounded, but because no other source of this termination has suggested itself.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 30. On pp. 18-19 Schulte cites a number of striking examples of conflations in which the readings of both the Vulgate and the Rushworth Latin texts are combined; one of these is the second half of 5:44, in which *Rushworth*[1] apparently equates an indicative with an optative—*hateþ ƒ fiegæ*. The reading of 25:41 illustrates the queer results of a careless conflation. The Rushworth Latin text reads: "in ignem æternum quem praeparauit pater meus diabulo"; the Lindisfarne Latin text, which is a Vulgate text resembling Farman's second original, reads: "in ignem æternum qui praeparatus est diabolo"; *Rushworth*[1] through a combination of these reads: "in ece fyr þte wæs gelarwad fæder min deofle."

[2] Thus, for example, E. Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1860), Part I, p. 324; M. Kaluza, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*[2] (Berlin, 1906, 1907), Part II, p. 169; H. C. Wyld, *A Short History of English* (New York, 1915), p. 194.

[3] Thus L. Morsbach, *Ueber den Ursprung der neuenglischen Schriftsprache* (Heilbronn, 1888), p. 134; H. Sweet, *A New English Grammar* (Oxford, 1900), Part I, p. 378; W. Zenke, *Synthesis und Analysis des Verbums im Orrmulum* (Halle, 1910), p. 32.

As more likely sources of this present plural indicative ending in *-n*, I wish to suggest the present plural indicative ending in *-n* belonging earlier to the preterite-present verbs and to such forms of the substantive verb as *sindon*, *earon*, and *biþon*. In support of this suggestion I shall present the results of an examination of various Old and Middle English texts.

As preliminary to a particular examination of the problem, it will be serviceable, I think, to define the conditions under which analogical leveling of originally distinct terminations may take place. Such leveling occurs only where there are very close points of contact, either (*a*) formal or (*b*) functional.

Formal contact, or analogy in form, which may result in a leveling of originally distinct terminations, exists wherever grammatical forms belonging to different categories are identical at certain points, so that the user, unconsciously extending the likeness, makes these forms identical at other points and thus levels out earlier distinctions. This kind of analogy has been actively operative in all periods of English. It produced, for example, the confusion in late West Saxon between such weak verbs of class I as *nerian* and weak verbs of class II—*bodian*, *lufian*, etc.;[1] in Middle English it was responsible for the extension of final *-e* to the nominative singular of originally long-stemmed feminine nouns, such as *lōre* (OE *lār*); and it is responsible for such a current neologism as the preterite *dove* from the infinitive *dive*. Examples might be multiplied.

Clearly there were no sufficient points of contact in form between the present indicative with singular endings (1) *u*, *o*, *e*, (2) *es(t)*, *as(t)*, (3) *eþ*, *aþ*, plural *aþ*, *iaþ*, and any of the various mood and tense forms (present optative, preterite indicative and optative, present indicative of preterite-presents or the substantive verb) which had *-on*, *-un*, *-an*, *-en*, etc., as plural termination. From whatever source the Midland present plural indicative ending came, the contact which resulted in the leveling out of the earlier *-þ* in favor of *-n* could not have been in form; it must have been in function.

Functional contact, or analogy in function, may obliterate original differences in termination through the operation of the natural tendency to express like relations in like manner. It brought

[1] Sievers, *Ags. Grammatik*[3] (Halle, 1898), sec. 400, Anm. 3.

about, for example, the supplantation of the various endings of the nominative-accusative plural of nouns which were employed in Old English by the *-s* ending which belonged earlier only to a single important class of masculines. It is largely responsible for the current tendency to obliterate the somewhat nice distinction between *shall* and *will* as auxiliaries of the future and to employ only *will*. This kind of analogy has been effective in all periods of the language.

The particular problem of this study is, then, to determine whether contact in function which would promote analogical leveling was closest (*a*) between the plural of the present indicative and of the present optative, or (*b*) between the present indicative and the present optative, plus the preterite indicative and optative, or (c) between the present plural indicative of normal verbs and the present plural indicative of preterite-present verbs and the verb "to be." A priori consideration obviously points to the contact indicated in (*c*) as the closest and the most likely to bring about analogical leveling. The evidence, I think, supports this a priori presumption.

I shall consider first the likelihood of leveling into the present indicative from the present optative. Every student of Old English realizes that the distinction in use between the indicative and the optative was not always clearly and sharply drawn. Although generally the use of one mood or the other at any stage of the language was in accord with fairly well-defined principles, so that one is sure that a writer felt the distinction between the two moods, yet in particular instances there appears to have been considerable confusion.[1] As a consequence of this lack of a sharply defined boundary

[1] For example, Matt. 2:13 in the Corpus MS of the West Saxon Gospels reads: "Toweard ys þ herodes secð þ cild to forspillenne," and the reading of the Hatton MS is similar; in Luke 9:44, however, both Corpus and Hatton have the optative in very much the same kind of expression, the reading of Corpus being: "Hit is towerd þ mannes sunu si geseald on manna handa." In this latter passage, both the *Rushworth* and the *Lindisfarne Glosses* have the indicative *bið* instead of the optative *si*. Even more striking an inconsistency appears in Luke 10:22, in which Corpus and Hatton employ both the indicative and the optative in exactly similar juxtaposed passages. Corpus has: "Nan man nat hwylc is se sunu buton se fæder ne hwylc si ðe fæder buton se sunu." The leaf containing this passage is lost from *Rushworth*, but *Lindisfarne* has the indicative in both instances. The Latin text of course has the subjunctive. Many similar instances might be gleaned *passim* from A. N. Henshaw's *The Syntax of the Indicative and Subjunctive Moods in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels* (Leipzig, 1894). Inconsistencies in Alfredian

between the syntax of the indicative and of the optative in some constructions, or coexistent with this lack, there was a tendency to transfer to the indicative or to express by the use of the so-called auxiliary verbs some functions once expressed by the optative.[1] Throughout the dialects in the later period of Old English there was some uncertainty on the part of users of the language as to whether to employ the indicative or the optative in certain constructions. To some extent, accordingly, there was a partial confusion in the use of the two moods; that is, there was some degree of close contact in function.

But several facts militate strongly against the assumption that, as a result of this functional contact between the two moods, the ending of the present plural indicative was replaced by that of the present optative. First, even in texts where apparent confusion of the two moods exists, so that occasionally an indicative appears instead of the normal optative, or vice versa, it is quite clear that the writer felt the distinction between the two, that they were not so confused as to be used interchangeably. Though in Alfred's prose there are a number of inconsistencies in mood,[2] yet no one would contend that in these writings the syntactic distinction between optative and indicative had so far broken down as to favor a breakdown in the formal distinction and thus make possible the displacement of the endings of one mood by those of the other. And the situation in later texts is similar: despite occasional encroachments of one mood

---

prose are cited in J. E. Wülfing's *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen* (Bonn, 1901), Part II, pp. 63-176. The same sort of inconsistency appears in the later entries of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. For example, the formula concluding the entry for 1085 reads: "Gebete hit God elmihtiga þonne his willa sy"; that at the end of the first section for 1131 is: "God hit bete þa his wille beþ." Instances might be presented, of course, from other Middle English texts—as also from Modern English.

[1] An illustration of the former is the gradual supplantation of the optative by the indicative in indirect discourse. See J. H. Gorrell, "Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon," in *PMLA*, X (1895), 342–485. On p. 483 Gorrell declares: "The subjunctive of reported statements after simple verbs of saying is the rule in early Anglo-Saxon, but chronologically considered, the use of the subjunctive and of the indicative after such expressions vary [*sic*] inversely. . . . . In the later post-Alfredian period, the great leveling of moods under the indicative tended to limit the use of the subjunctive after verbs of saying to expressions of possibility, contingency, condition, etc." A not wholly satisfactory presentation of the growth of the use of auxiliaries to supplant the optative may be found *passim* in Gerald Hotz's *On the Use of the Subjunctive Mood in Anglo-Saxon and Its Further History in Old English* (Zurich, 1882).

[2] See Wülfing, *op. cit.*, especially p. 147.

upon what was, or had been, the field of the other, the distinction between the two was unquestionably felt. Second, in Middle English texts of all dialects the distinction between present indicative and present optative is clearly preserved. Even in the East Midland dialect, where the present indicative plural had adopted the ending *-e(n)* and accordingly had come to have the same form as the present optative plural, the distinction in form was preserved in the singular.[1] It is hardly possible to conceive of any confusion of function that affected only the plural form and left the singular untouched. In the Northern and the Southern dialects the syntactic difference between indicative and optative continued to be marked, in the plural as well as in the singular, by distinct terminations. Finally, as is well known, what tendency there has been in English toward leveling out the distinction between optative and indicative has at all times been generally toward supplanting the former by the latter.[2] It is of course possible that a single instance should contravene a general tendency, but unless such a contravention of normal development is shown to have been especially favored by circumstances it can hardly be assumed as probable. It appears to me, then, that although there was some degree of functional contact between indicative and optative, yet the evidence discredits the theory that as a result of this contact alone the present plural indicative ending in *-þ* actually was displaced by that of the optative in *-n*. The contact between the moods may have been a factor in the development of this *-n* ending in the indicative, but it can hardly have been the chief cause.

The theory that the ending in question was extended from the present optative, plus the preterite indicative and optative, is supported by whatever argument there is for extension from the present optative alone and, in addition, by a plausible assumption. After the lightly stressed vowels of the personal endings had weakened in character and had thus become indistinguishable in speech, the plural endings of the present optative, the preterite indicative, and the

[1] In the very earliest Midland material, that in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the present optative singular ending *-e* is kept altogether distinct from the indicative endings *-est*, *-eþ* (*aþ*, *oþ*). See the forms cited by Meyer, pp. 79–84, 99, 103–5.

[2] The one important exception to this general tendency is in the use of the optative instead of the indicative in the protasis of a simple condition. See Hotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 ff.

preterite optative all fell together. The assumption is that when these three plural forms of the verb came to be indicated indistinguishably by *-n* preceded by a colorless vowel, this *-n* termination became felt as the generic plural sign and displaced the earlier present plural indicative ending in *-þ*. Such a displacement is much like that whereby in other instances originally distinct terminations have later been leveled out—for example, in nouns the supplantation of various nominative-accusative plural endings by that in *-s*, which belonged earlier only to masculine *a*-stems. This theory of the introduction of the *-n* ending into the present plural indicative, supported as it is by the analogy of similar levelings, appears very plausible, and on a priori consideration seems an adequate and satisfactory explanation. But it is merely an assumption for which there is no direct evidence; there is no actual interchange in Old English texts of *-aþ*, *-on*, *-en* which would prove the existence of a linguistic feeling for a common plural termination in these different moods and tenses.

My own belief, as already stated, is that this present plural indicative ending traces back much more directly to the present plural indicative ending of preterite-present verbs and of certain forms of the verb "to be" (*earon*, *sindon*, *biþon*) than it does to the sources hitherto suggested. I shall consider first the preterite-present verbs.

It is obvious, I think, that a closer functional contact existed between the present indicative of normal verbs and the same mood and tense of preterite-present verbs than between present indicative and present optative of normal verbs, or than between present indicative and a combination of present optative and preterite indicative and optative. Many of the preterite-present verbs which were most frequently used and which were therefore most apt starting points for analogical levelings were used, not primarily as auxiliaries, but exactly as normal verbs. It is almost inconceivable that *witan* ("know"), *cunnan* ("know, be acquainted with"), *agan* ("possess"), *unnan* ("grant"), *munan* ("remember") should have been kept strongly distinguished in form from normal verbs whose function was identical with their own. From this functional identity, a confusion in form and a later leveling were most likely.

Evidence of the confusion in form from which a later leveling may be assumed appears in a number of Old English texts in various dialects. In West Saxon, where the conservative influence of a cultivated and literary *Schriftsprache* was strongest, this confusion was least apparent, yet its occurrence in this dialect is clear. Sievers notes in late West Saxon for the preterite-present *gemunan* a complete set of present indicative forms taken over from the normal verb.[1] In Ælfric's rendering of some of the Old Testament the preterite-present *āgan* also has forms belonging properly to the normal verb.[2] Undoubtedly a search of other late West Saxon texts would show a number of similar forms in other preterite-present verbs. In the Mercian and Northumbrian dialects, where the language was less protected from natural tendencies, the evidences of confusion are much more impressive. In *Rushworth*[1] [3] *cunnan* in the present plural indicative ends five times in *-un*, *-an*, and three times in *-þ*; and the only present indicative singular of *gemunan* is *gemynest*, with the ending of a normal verb. In the *Lindisfarne Gloss to the Gospels*,[4] out of a total of fifty-five present indicative plurals of *wuta* there are ten forms with the ending *-s* or *-ð*; *cunna* in six occurrences has one form in *-s;* the only present indicative plurals of *ðorfa* are two forms in *-ð*,[5] and the only singular has also adopted the ending *-ð* from normal verbs; and *mona* in the only occurrences has one singular and one plural in *-ș*. In *Rushworth*[2], the Northumbrian portion of the *Rushworth Gloss to the Gospels*,[6] *wuta* has six forms in *-s* or *-ð* out of a total of forty-four present plural indicatives, and *gemuna*, in its only occurrences in the present indicative, has one singular in *-ð* and one plural in *-s*.

The same sort of contamination appears in Middle English texts of the South, as the following examples from early documents show. The *Poema Morale* in the Jesus MS has *schulleþ* in lines 103 and 264;

[1] *Ags. Gram.*, ed. 3, sec. 423, 9, Anm. 2.

[2] Deuteronomy 4:22, *ge agaþ*; 5:33, a first person singular present indicative *age*. See C. Brühl, *Die Flexion des Verbums in Ælfrics Heptateuch und Buch Hiob* (Marburg, 1892), pp. 90–92.

[3] See Brown, Part II, sec. 52.

[4] See Theodor Kolbe, "Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien," *Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie* (Bonn, 1912), V, 95 ff.

[5] Except one *ðurfu we*, as to which see Sievers, *Ags. Gram.*, sec. 360, 2, Anm. 3.

[6] See Lindelöf's *Die Südnorthumbrische Mundart*, pp. 149 ff.

versions E and *e* in the Egerton MS have *witeþ* in line 290, and E also has *sculled* in line 284.[1] The A-version of Laȝamon's *Brut* has a second person singular *agest*, a plural *agæð*, and a large number of plurals in *-eð* (*ed*) of Old English *sculan*. The B-version has a second person singular *canest*, a plural *witeþ*, several plurals *ogeþ*, *oweþ*, and five plurals in *-eþ* of Old English *sculan*.[2] In *The Owl and the Nightingale* both manuscripts have *witest* as well as *wost*, and the Jesus MS has a plural *nuteþ* of this verb and two instances of the plural *schulleþ*.[3] A later text, the so-called *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*, has a plural *moweþ*, eight plurals *ssoleþ* (*ssulleþ*), and six *witeþ* (*nuteþ*, *nyteþ*).[4] Examples of preterite-present verbs with the endings of normal verbs might be multiplied from Southern Middle English documents.

The forms cited above from Old and Middle English documents show the transfer of endings from normal verbs to preterite-present verbs; that is, they clearly show a tendency to level out the personal endings of one class in favor of the other. In the forms cited, the tendency was toward supplanting the endings of preterite-present by those of normal verbs; in earlier stages of Old English, however, in all dialects as well as in other Germanic dialects, at one point the ending of the preterite-presents largely displaced that of normal verbs—in the second person singular present indicative, where *-st* supplanted *-s*. Though the addition of *-t* here was probably due in part to enclisis of the pronoun subject, there is no question as to the determining influence of the analogy of the preterite-presents.[5]

It is clear, then, that the relationship between preterite-presents and normal verbs was extremely close—so close that personal endings belonging properly to one class actually, in particular instances,

[1] For bibliographical data see Zupitza-Schipper, *Alt- und mittelenglisches Übungsbuch*[11] (Vienna and Leipzig, 1915), p. 86.

[2] See Max Böhnke, *Die Flexion des Verbums in Laȝamons Brut* (Berlin, 1906), pp. 74 ff.

[3] See J. E. Wells, "Accidence in 'The Owl and the Nightingale'," *Anglia*, XXXIII, 268–69.

[4] See F. Pabst, "Flexionsverhältnisse bei Robert von Gloucester," *Anglia*, XIII, 236–38.

[5] See Sievers, *Ags. Gram.*, ed. 3, sec. 356, and Anm. 1, for the situation in Old English. For the process of displacement see Joseph and Mary Elizabeth Wright, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1908), p. 240; W. Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* (Halle, 1911), 3d and 4th eds., sec. 306, *b*, Anm. 5; and F. Kluge, *Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialekte* (Strassburg, 1913), 3d ed., p. 163.

were transferred to the other. This leveling, too, was not always in favor of the endings proper to the more numerous normal verbs; actually, in the second person singular of the present indicative in all dialects, a preterite-present ending to a very considerable extent displaced the ending of normal verbs. Exactly similar to this latter development would be the displacement of the normal present plural indicative ending in *-þ* by that of the preterite-present in *-n*.

The present plural ending of the preterite-presents also exerted a strong leveling influence upon the form of the substantive verb. The present plural *sindon -un* (originally of the third person only), which appears not only in all dialects of Old English but in Old High German and Old Saxon as well, owes its added *-on, -un* to the analogy of the preterite-present verbs.[1] In the Anglian dialects, Mercian and Northumbrian, this ending extended its scope very greatly. In the *Vespasian Psalter* and *Hymns*, Mercian texts from the first half of the ninth century, *sind* (*sin*) occurs 133 times as against a total of 24 forms in *-un, -on* (18 *sindun -on*, 6 *earun*).[2] In *Rushworth*[1], a predominantly Mercian text about a hundred years later, the proportion of forms with the extended ending is reversed as compared with the earlier text: *Rushworth*[1] has 59 *sindun -on* and only 6 *sint*, and it also has a single *arun*. Further, in *Rushworth*[1] this ending has been extended from the stem **es*, to which it was first attached, and has made its way into the stem **bheu:* by the side of 26 *beoþ* (*bioþ*) are 7 *beoþan* and 1 *biðon*.[3] The other late Mercian material has altogether only three occurrences of "to be"—in the *Life of St. Chad* one *beoð* (l. 223) and one *earun* (l. 244), in the *Royal Glosses* a single *sind*. These single instances constitute very little evidence of any value. Northumbrian texts of approximately the same date as *Rushworth*[1] [4] show a similar extension of the *-n* ending. In the gloss to the *Durham Ritual*,

[1] Wright's *Old English Grammar*, p. 277, is misleadingly brief in presenting "*sindon -un* with the ending of the pret. pl. added on." O. Behagel, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*[3] (Strassburg, 1911), p. 276, states more exactly: "Für die 3. Pers. Pl. bestand die Nebenform *sindun*, in Angleichung an die Präterito-Präsentia, die 1. u. 2. Pers. Pl. schon nahe standen." See also W. Wilmans, *Deutsche Grammatik* (Strassburg, 1906), 3te Abt., 1. Hälfte, sec. 28, 3; and W. Streitberg, *Urgermanische Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1896), p. 318.

[2] The occurrences are listed in C. Grimm's "Glossar zum Vespasian-Psalter und den Hymnen," *Anglistische Forschungen* (Heidelberg, 1906), XVIII, 55.

[3] See Brown, *op. cit.*, Part II, pp. 68–69.

[4] See Bülbring, *Ae. Elementarbuch*, secs. 24–25.

sind (*sint*) occurs only 5 times to 21 *sindon*, and there are also 7 *aro* (*n*). To the stem **bheu* there are 29 *biðo(n)* and not a single plural with the normal, unextended ending in *-þ(ð)*.[1] In the *Lindisfarne Gloss to the Gospels*, the proportion of *sind* to *sindon* forms is much higher than in any other late Anglian text, the numbers being 29 *sindon* to 168 *sind*. But this text shows 94 *aron*(*aru*), and a complete displacement of the normal present plural indicative of the stem **bheu* by a form with the ending *-on* that traces back ultimately to preterite-present verbs. The figures are 200 *biðon* (*biðo*, *bioðon*), 2 *biað*, 2 *bið*(*ð*). In all probability the two *bið*(*ð*) are properly singular forms; the two *biað* show extension of the ending of normal verbs into the substantive verb, as does a singular *bieð*. This text also has a second person singular *arst*, through the analogy of the preterite-presents.[2] In *Rushworth*[2], *sindon* again greatly outnumbers *sint*, the figures being 77 *sindon* to 28 *sint*. There are also 35 *aron* (*arun*). In this text, too, the normal plural of **bheu* has been completely displaced by forms with added *-on*, *-un;* there are 85 *bioðon* (*un*, *o*) and only 3 *biað*[3] and these three *biað* are due to the analogy of normal verbs, as in *Lindisfarne* above. Thus, by the end of the tenth century, in both the Anglian dialects the various stems of the verb "to be" generally had come to have the present plural indicative end in *-on*, *-un*, an ending derived ultimately or immediately from the preterite-present group of verbs.

The situation existing in these dialects, as shown in the preceding paragraphs, was most favorable to the further extension of this *-n* ending into the present plural indicative of normal verbs. In the first place, this ending had so far extended its use from the preterite-presents into the substantive verb as to be characteristic of both these important verb classes. Verb forms of these classes were in most frequent and general use, and had close functional contact with normal verbs; on both accounts, therefore, they were apt starting-points for an analogical leveling. Either the group of preterite-presents alone or the substantive verb alone could exert a strong influence upon the form of other verbs; the analogy of both in combination

[1] See Uno Lindelöf, "Wörterbuch zur Interlinearglosse des Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis," *Bonner Beiträge* (Bonn, 1901), IX, 231, under *vosa*.

[2] See Kolbe's *Konjugation*, pp. 100–102.

[3] See Lindelöf, *Südnorthumbrische Mundart*, p. 150.

multiplied this influence. In the second place, this *-n* ending was showing very great vigor—it had developed in use far beyond its original scope and was apparently in the active stage of further extension. Under these circumstances, if there were no powerful contrary tendencies, the displacement of the plural in *-þ*, which belonged to normal verbs, by that in *-n*, which was common to both the substantive verb and the preterite-presents, was a natural step, in full accord with usual linguistic process. In Mercian (Midland), so far as I have observed, there were no strong opposing tendencies; on the contrary, the displacement was favored by whatever functional contact there was between present indicative and present optative, and by whatever tendency may have existed toward the development of a general plural termination through the extension of the ending *-n* from the present optative and the preterite indicative and optative into the present indicative.[1]

In Northumbrian (Northern), however, a similar extension of *-n* into the present plural indicative did encounter a very strong opposing tendency—that toward the generalization of *-s* as the ending of all persons of the present indicative, plural as well as singular. In the *Durham Ritual*[2] the earlier endings in *-þ* were still more numerous in the third person singular and in the plural than were endings in *-s*. In *Rushworth*[2] and *Lindisfarne*,[3] though *-þ* was used more often in the third person singular, *-s* was considerably more frequent in the plural. In all three of these texts *-þ* appeared occasionally in the second person singular, but in none of them had *-s* or *-þ* made its way into the first person singular. So vigorous, however, was this *-s* termination that in Middle English texts of the Northern dialect it had supplanted all other personal endings of the present indicative (except when the verb was in immediate contact with a personal pronoun subject), and thus had become the characteristic present indicative ending in both numbers and all persons. It had even established itself in the stem **bheu*, both singular and plural. The extraordinary vigor of this ending forestalled the extension of the *-n* termination in the Northern dialect.

[1] See above, pp. 464–67.

[2] See Uno Lindelöf, *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham* (Helsingfors, 1890), pp. 72 ff.

[3] See Lindelöf, *Südnorthumbrische Mundart*, pp. 128 ff., and Kolbe, *Konjugation*, pp. 107 ff.

In the Southern dialect the present plural indicative ending in *-þ* remained in normal verbs throughout the Middle English period. The retention of this ending in Southern, as contrasted with its displacement in Northern and Midland, is to be explained in great part, I think, by the power of the analogy of the substantive verb. In late West Saxon texts the ending *-on, -un* was not extended to the substantive verb so greatly as it was in Mercian and Northumbrian: *earon* was not used in the South; *sind* appears to have been fully as common as *sindon*;[1] and *-on, -un* was never attached to *bheu, the present plural of this stem remaining *beoþ*. The form *beoþ* had much greater vitality than *sind* (*on*), and during the transition period completely displaced the latter, which disappeared from Southern texts.[2] The analogy of this plural *beoþ* must have operated powerfully to strengthen and preserve the plural in *-þ* of normal verbs.[3] The situation was precisely the reverse of that in the Midland dialect, where through the extension of the *-n* termination to the substantive verb the influence of the preterite-presents toward the analogical displacement of *-þ* by *-n* was enormously reinforced.

W. F. BRYAN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

[1] The distribution of *sind* and *sindon* in late West Saxon tests is peculiar. In the *Blickling Homilies* (ed. R. Morris, E.E.T.S., Nos. 58, 63, 73), *syndon* and *synt* occur with approximately equal frequency. In the *Gospel of Nichodemus* (ed. W. H. Hulme, *PMLA*, XIII, 457 ff.), the Cotton MS has only *syndon*, and the single *synd* of the Cambridge MS is probably a scribal error. In the *West Saxon Gospels* (ed. J. W. Bright, Boston, 1904, 1905, 1906) I have gone over the first eight chapters of Matthew, Mark, and John, and found in Matthew 21 *synt* (*synd*), in Mark 25, and in John 22; I found no *syndon* in these chapters.

[2] See Karl Jost, "Beon und Wesan; eine syntaktische Untersuchung," *Anglistische Forschungen* (Heidelberg, 1909), XXVI, 110 ff. Jost shows, for example, that in a copy of one of Ælfric's homilies, the frequently occurring *sind* (*on*) of the original has been replaced in every instance by *beoþ*. In the A-version of Laȝamon's *Brut*, by the side of usual *beoð* are some instances of *sunden;* in the B-version, in all the nine instances where the text corresponds with that of A, *sunden* has been given up in favor of *beoð*.

[3] One may, of course, assume—contrary to the opinion expressed above—that *sind* (*on*) was given up and *beoþ* preserved through the influence of normal verbs with present plural ending in *-þ*. This assumption seems to me altogether unlikely. If *sind* (*on*) had been in vigorous current use, the analogy of normal verbs would have operated not to displace *sind* (*on*) entirely, but to attach to it the plural ending of normal verbs (*aþ, eþ*), as was actually the case in Laȝamon A22153 and 24766 (*sundeð*), and 27319 (*seondeð*). The fact that *sind* (*on*) wholly disappeared from Southern texts even of the early Middle English period shows very positively, I think, that it had previously fallen out of use, so that in the South only *beoþ* remained in currency.

THE ARRANGEMENT AND DATES OF MILTON'S SONNETS

Professor David Harrison Stevens, in a recent article entitled "The Order of Milton's Sonnets,"[1] has worked out a new chronology for these pieces based primarily on the hypothesis that Milton himself intended to arrange them according to the time of their composition and that their order in the 1645 edition and their designated order in the Cambridge Manuscript may therefore be relied on for the determination of doubtful points. Proved disagreement between the Cambridge Manuscript and the edition of 1673 is held to strengthen the supposition that the departures from the chronological order in that volume did not have Milton's sanction.

In reopening the question of chronology and in directing attention to the data afforded by the Cambridge Manuscript, Professor Stevens has rendered a necessary service to Milton scholarship. A review of his conclusions is made desirable by what appears to be unsoundness in some of his arguments and by the existence of evidence in addition to what has hitherto been brought forward. We may consider first the problem of the arrangement of the sonnets in the 1673 edition.

The poems chiefly in question are the two divorce sonnets—XI, "A book was writ of late called Tetrachordon," and XII, "I did but prompt the age to quit their clogs"—and the poem "On the New Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament." Sonnets XI and XII stand in that order and numbering in the 1673 edition. In the manuscript, however, they occur in the inverse order and numbering both in the drafts in Milton's hand and in an amanuensis copy. Stevens is in agreement with Masson and is undoubtedly right in dating Sonnet XII (11) before Sonnet XI (12), but the explanation of the change in the 1673 edition is still wanting. The "Forcers of Conscience" stands without number after the sonnet to Vane on

[1] *Modern Philology*, XVII (1919), 25–33.

folio [48][1] of the manuscript in the hand of an amanuensis. There is, however, a notation in Milton's hand between his own transcript of Sonnet XI (12) and the sonnet to Fairfax on folio 47, "on ye forcers of Conscience to come in heer," followed by "turn over the leafe" in the hand of the scribe who copied the poem, while on folio [48] there is the deleted notation beside the title of the piece and in the same hand: "to come in as directed on the leafe before." In the 1673 edition the poem stands after the sonnet series and separated from it by the translation from Horace and the "Vacation Exercise" (7 pages). What are we to infer to have been Milton's intention regarding its position?

It would seem probable that Milton had been of two minds about the poem, whether to regard it as a sonnet and place it with the two divorce pieces to which it is related in subject-matter and tone, or, because of its difference in form, to separate it entirely from the series. This would account for his having omitted to record it earlier in the Cambridge Manuscript[2] and for his having left it unnumbered. The fact that the notation on folio [48] is canceled and that the piece stands apart from the series in the 1673 edition might be supposed to indicate that Milton returned in the end to his first intention, the scribe having simply omitted to cross out the notation on folio 47. To prove conclusively that in preparing the material for the press Milton separated the "Forcers of Conscience" from the divorce sonnets and to gain further light on the poet's plans for a second edition of his minor verse we have to consider a set of facts about the Cambridge Manuscript of which Professor Stevens has made only partial use.

It has long been recognized that two sheets of the manuscript, folios 45–[46] (which should be reversed) and folios 49–[50], originally belonged to a separate set of papers. They are shorter than the rest and are said to be of different manufacture. The first of these,

[1] Following Stevens' practice I have numbered the MS pages according to the numbers on the alternate pages of the document itself and not according to Wright's facsimile. The correct numbers for unnumbered folios appear in brackets. In the case of the sonnets, roman numerals give the numbering in the 1673 edition, Arabic that in the Cambridge MS.

[2] Whatever the date of the poem (see below) it cannot be later than the Vane sonnet. That the poem was in existence when Milton still had the use of his eyes is proved by the notation in his hand on folio 47.

headed "these sonnets follow ye 10 in ye printed booke," contains (folio [46]) copies of Sonnets XII[1] and XI (numbered 11, 12) in the hand of one amanuensis, A, and (folio 45) Sonnets XIII and XIV (13, 14) in the same hand; the second contains (folio 49) the last ten lines of Sonnet XVIII, "Cyriack whose grandsire," and the whole of "Cyriack this three years day" (numbered 22) in a second scribal hand, B, also (folio [50]) Sonnet XIX, "Methought I saw" (numbered 23), in still a third hand, C. Besides the folio numbers in the upper right-hand corner, which designate the position of these papers in the Cambridge volume and are not in Milton's hand, folio [46] has in the left margin the number 1 (scribe A?), and folio 49 in a corresponding position the number 7 (scribe B). Evidently we have here two fragments of a transcript of the sonnets with two full leaves (4 pages, folios [3–6]) missing between them. Now the sonnets on folios [46]–45 (1 and [2] of the transcript) are copies of poems already in the long-leaf portion of the manuscript in Milton's hand, while those on folios 49–[50] (7–[8]) are found only here. Furthermore, scribe A has made extensive corrections in the original drafts of the sonnets (folios 43–[44], and 47–[48]), including those to Cromwell and Vane and the poem on the Forcers of Conscience, which are missing from the preserved folios of the transcript. Apparently Milton had directed him to prepare the whole group as it stands in the long-leaf portion of the manuscript for the press and to copy out the material in order as numbered, i.e., the four sonnets on folio [46]–45, and also Fairfax, 15, Cromwell, 16, Vane, 17, and the "Forcers of Conscience," without number at the end. It is reasonable to suppose that this process took place between 1652, the date of the Cromwell and Vane sonnets, and 1655, the date of the two Cyriack Skinner sonnets, for we find no traces of scribe A's hand on folios 49–[50].[2]

[1] The roman numerals refer to the numbering in the 1673 edition, from which the Fairfax, Cromwell, and Vane sonnets and the second sonnet to Skinner were omitted for political reasons.

[2] More precisely, a date in the fall or winter of 1653–54 is suggested by the known details of Milton's biography. Milton had been in large measure relieved of the duties of the secretaryship in December, 1652, and Masson (IV, 519 ff.) shows that he must have enjoyed considerable leisure for over a year, only four of his state letters falling between February, 1653, and June, 1654. The *Second Defense* was probably not undertaken before 1654 (published in May). The resumption of the more or less mechanical work of translating the Psalms, finished in August, 1653, and the determination to

Assuming for the moment that the "Forcers of Conscience" was actually included in the transcript (Professor Stevens thinks it was not), we have a reconstruction of the document as it stood by 1655. It seems likely that Milton, feeling that he cared to, or was to, write no more minor poems, was projecting a second edition, to include all the work which he had written up to that time. The Piedmont massacre, however, in April, 1655, brought a second and greater inspiration to the sonnet form. Five poems, Piedmont [18],[1] "When I consider" [19],[1] Lawrence [20],[1] "Cyriack whose grandsire" [21],[1] and "Cyriack, this three years day," 22, were composed in that year, and the sixth, "Methought I saw," 23, after the death of his second wife in 1658. These sonnets were, we may assume, written in the transcript by various scribes, as they were composed.[2] For confirmation of this account of the contents of the transcript, and particularly of the conjecture that the "Forcers of Conscience," unnumbered, was included in it, we have only to calculate the space left for the missing material on pages [4–6]. The preserved pages contain two sonnets each (a little less in the hand of scribe B). Counting the "Forcers of Conscience" (20 lines) with the first four lines of "Cyriack whose grandsire" (which must have stood at the bottom of page 6) as the equivalent of nearly two sonnets, we have a perfect fit.

It should now be clear that Milton himself determined the position of the "Forcers of Conscience," out of chronological order, after the sonnet series, where it stands in the edition of 1673. We may next inquire whether the reversal of the divorce sonnets may not also have been made under his direction. A possible reason for the change is at once apparent in the fact that Sonnet XI (12), naming the Tetrachordon, comes appropriately first, since the reader would find the bearing of Sonnet XII (11) unintelligible without it, unless

---

issue a second edition of his poems may be connected with these facts and with his blindness. I assume that he would have wished to finish the versions for inclusion in the edition. The notation *vide ante*, opposite the page number on folio 1 of the transcript, may refer to the copy containing them, which has not been preserved.

[1] The order is that of the 1673 edition, where these three sonnets are numbered XV, XVI, and XVII.

[2] Not much later certainly, for we know from other dated documents in his hand that scribe C was working for Milton about 1658–60. See Hanford, "The Date Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana*," *Studies in Philology*, June, 1920.

indeed the original title, "On the Detraction which followed upon my writing certain Treatises," had been retained. It *is* retained in the transcript, where, it will be remembered, the sonnets stand in their original order and numbering. But it had not been Milton's earlier intention to preserve it. It is deleted in the first draft, though the cancellation is so inconspicuously made (an "x" through the single word "detraction") that it would be easy for the scribe to overlook it. This I assume that he did; but before the edition had issued from the press (presumably during the preparation of a second press transcript)[1] the error was corrected by a return to Milton's original intention. The change in the order of the sonnets followed as a natural consequence and even so it was found necessary to connect Sonnet XII with Sonnet XI by the caption "On the same." This certainly looks like the author's work.

In view of the evidence that Milton rearranged his sonnets in preparing them for the press it now becomes necessary to set aside the assumption that their designated order in the press transcript (with the corresponding scribal numbering of Milton's originals) can be trusted for purposes of chronology. That Sonnet XII (11) was written earlier than Sonnet XI (12) is, as I have remarked, reasonably certain on other grounds. But is it certain that they were written consecutively or that they both antedate the sonnets which follow them in the edition? Milton would in any case have wished them to stand together, and because of their difference in tone from the others he would have found it natural to place them either at the beginning or end of the later series. As a matter of fact the evidence of their original positions in Milton's portion of the Cambridge Manuscript is strongly against the conclusion that they belong together chronologically. Sonnet XII (11) follows the two drafts of the Lawes sonnet on folio 43 of the manuscript; Sonnet XI (12) is at the top of folio 45, the intervening page being partly occupied

[1] It seems probable that such a transcript existed. The corrections in the first transcript, particularly in Sonnet 22, and the necessity of adjusting the position of the "Forcers of Conscience" and of incorporating new material would have made a new copy desirable. Moreover, the fact that the two fragments of the first press transcript remained in Milton's hands would seem to indicate that this is not the document which was actually submitted to the printer. Whether Milton himself supervised the printing of the edition and what unauthorized changes, if any, were made by the printer remain open questions.

with the two drafts of the sonnet on Mrs. Thompson. If the two divorce sonnets were written consecutively before the sonnet to Lawes, as Professor Stevens assumes, Milton's drafts must both be copies of earlier originals, for the Lawes and Mrs. Thompson sonnets are pretty evidently first working drafts. We may admit that Milton may for some reason have reserved the two divorce sonnets apart and later decided to copy them in with the rest, but then it is hard to see why, in so doing, he should have failed to place Sonnet XI (12) at the top of folio [44], or, supposing the copying to have been done after the writing of the sonnet on Mrs. Thompson, in the blank space at the bottom of folio [44], which corresponds in size to that in which the draft of Sonnet XI (12) was written on folio 43.[1] Equally suspicious is the fact that the drafts of the two divorce sonnets were not, apparently, written with the same pen. It seems more likely, on the showing of the manuscript, that both Sonnets XII and XI are first drafts and occur in the manuscript in their chronological relation to the Lawes and Mrs. Thompson sonnets, or that Sonnet XII (11) is a copy and Sonnet XI (12) a first draft, some support for the second alternative being given by the appearance of the writing and the character of the emendations, as well as by the fact that Sonnet XII (11) does not begin a page.[2]

Obviously such inferences are not reliable enough to stand in the face of unequivocal evidence of other kinds, but there is no such evidence. Stevens dates Sonnet XII (11) in the fall of 1644 on the ground that it shows a spirit of active conflict such as would have possessed Milton during the first heat of resentment against the "barbarous noise" of his detractors. It may, however, be read as an expression of deepening realization of the character of the Presbyterian tyranny, rather than as a mere outburst of personal anger, and a date soon after the Lawes sonnet, Feb. 9, 1645 (i.e., 1646),

[1] The two spaces measure almost exactly the same. Sonnet XI (12) being without title would have taken up less room than Sonnet XII (11).

[2] In the draft of Sonnet XII (11) one whole line is re-written, with the same pen as the original. The writing is even and there are no other alterations. In Sonnet XI (12) Milton has evidently hesitated long over the epithet in the line, "These rugged names," etc. He at first wrote "barbarous," then "rough-hewn," repeating the latter in the margin, and finally "rugged." The text of the poem by no means satisfied him even so, for he later instructed scribe A to make extensive alterations. All this points to the fact that the draft was set down while the poem was still in process of composition.

is not at all impossible. This would, at least, have the advantage of explaining why the poem was not included in the edition of 1645; some weight, also, may be attached to its similarity in theme and tone with the "Forcers of Conscience" (1646, see below). The Tetrachordon sonnet, following as it does the sonnet to Mrs. Thompson, whose death occurred December, 1646, would, if the chronology suggested by the Cambridge Manuscript is adopted, have to be assigned to the year 1647 or later. This would perhaps better fit the rather whimsical tone of the poem and Milton's statement that the Tetrachordon, published March, 1645, had "walked the town a while" before it was forgotten, than Stevens' date, the summer of 1645. I dissent vigorously from the opinion that Mistress Milton's return to London in August or September would terminate her husband's interest in the fate of his last pamphlets or in the question of divorce![1]

In the case of the "Forcers of Conscience" I agree with Professor Stevens that Masson's date, the first months of 1646, based on the references in the poem to the attacks of Baillie and Edwards, is too early. It is a part of the conspiracy to interpret everything in Milton's poetry in narrowly personal terms. Stevens' ascription of the piece to the beginning of the year 1647 is much more reasonable, but the assumption that Milton's notation on folio 47 fixes its position after the sonnet to Mrs. Thompson, in or later than December, 1646, is obviously unsound. The note indicates only that the poem was to follow Sonnet XI (12), not that it was to come between XIV and XV, and even so it tells us nothing of its chronological position. It is perhaps more likely that the poem was written immediately after the passage of the ordinance of August 28, 1646, though it may have been composed just before this final realization of the "just fears" of Milton and the Independents. The whole matter is conjectural, but I feel that the chronological sequence—Sonnet XII (11) (1645–46); the "Forcers of Conscience" (summer [?] of 1646); Sonnet XIV (December, 1646); and Sonnet XI (12) (1647–48)[2]—is the best that we can do on the available evidence.

[1] The continuation of Milton's interest in the subject of divorce is evident from the chapters devoted to it in the *Christian Doctrine*. But the poem is not strictly speaking a "divorce sonnet."

[2] I.e., before the Fairfax sonnet.

The doubtful points in the chronology of the sonnet group published in the 1645 edition concern the date of the poem "To a Nightingale" (Sonnet I) and of the Italian pieces (Sonnets II–VI with the Canzone). The first of these is placed by Masson in the Horton period; the others have been assumed to be products of Milton's Italian journey (1638–39). These dates have, however, been challenged and Professor Stevens suggests that the position of Sonnets I–VI before Sonnet VII, "How Soon Hath Time" (1631), strengthens the opinion that they were written at Cambridge as literary exercises in the fashion of the day. Now, the general proposition that the order in which Milton chose to arrange his sonnets constitutes a trustworthy guide to their chronology is, as we have seen, a doubtful one. He did not in the 1645 edition hesitate to modify the chronological order of the other poems when there was good reason to do so. Thus he naturally preferred to begin the volume with the great "Nativity Ode" (1629) rather than with the juvenile paraphrases of the Psalms. And in arranging the Latin elegies he placed Elegy VII at the end of the series though it had been written earlier than Elegy VI. None the less Professor Stevens is undoubtedly right in his conclusion that Milton attached considerable importance to the time of life at which his poems were written, and desired, other considerations being indifferent, to have the arrangement indicate a progression corresponding to his years. The sonnet "On Arriving at the Age of Twenty Three" constitutes a dividing point in his career and the placing of Sonnets I–VI before it may be significant. Unfortunately for the certainty of our conclusions there were also artistic reasons for such an arrangement, for Sonnet I constitutes a fitting introduction to the Italian poems and the whole group is sharply distinguished from the later poems in subject-matter and tone. We are forced, therefore, in our attempt to reach a decision as to their date to rely primarily on other kinds of evidence. Such evidence exists in certain biographical suggestions, hitherto overlooked, which seem to unite this group very closely with the Latin elegies addressed to Diodati. In Elegy I (1625–26) Milton says that Cupid has as yet granted him immunity from love. In Elegy VII (1627) he declares that the blind boy has stricken him with the beauty of a nameless maiden in revenge for

his earlier scorn. In Sonnet I (the first lines of which are translated from vss. 25–26 of Elegy V, 1629) he avows himself servant of the Muse and Love and prays for success. In Sonnet IV he writes, in language which closely parallels the opening of Elegy VII:

> Diodati (e te 'l dirò con maraviglia)
> Quel ritroso io, ch'amor spreggiar solea
> E de' suoi lacci spesso mi ridea,
> Gia caddi, ov' uom dabben talor s'impiglia.[1]

Finally, in the envoy to Elegy VII, written at some later time, he declares that he has been freed by philosophy from his youthful errors and is henceforth proof against the tyranny of love, while in Elegy VI (written at the Christmas season of the year 1629) he seems to imply that he has bidden or is about to bid farewell to amatory themes.

In these utterances we seem to have playful but coherent record, expressed in a leash of languages for the edification of his friend, of a well-defined phase of the young poet's experience. It seems unlikely that the light game would ever have been renewed. With the composition of the "Nativity Ode," about Christmas, 1629, Milton's poetry, in accordance with the intention implied in Elegy VI, takes on a decidedly higher and more serious tone. The pieces in Latin and English which we know to have been composed in Italy or at Horton are entirely untouched by the Petrarchan mood. That Milton should be found writing to Diodati in 1638–39 in the strain which he had used a whole decade earlier is well-nigh incredible. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, therefore, I should date Sonnets I–VI between Elegies VII and VI, i.e., in 1628–29, certainly not later than the sonnet "On Arriving at the Age of Twenty Three."

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

[1] "Saepe cupidineas, puerilia tela, sagittas,
Atque tuum sprevi, maxime numen, Amor."

ALFRED TENNYSON AS A CELTICIST

The few non-Celtic romances and chronicles which form the chief sources of Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* have long been known, and it has generally been assumed that the poet's direct contact with Arthurian tradition in Celtic scarcely extended beyond Lady Guest's translation of the *Mabinogion*.[1] That this assumption is unjustified forms the burden of the following observations. Even the brief sketch here given should establish the fact that Tennyson responded as heartily to the early nineteenth-century revival of Celtic antiquities as he did to other phases of contemporary investigation.

> Veuillent les immortels, protecteurs de ma langue,
> Que je ne dise rien qui doive être repris!

At the outset it is improbable that, in composing a series of poems on a theme which fascinated his imagination from youth to old age, a writer of Tennyson's scholarly tastes and omnivorous literary habits, should have confined his reading to a few medieval romances and one or two Latin chronicles, when supposedly more authentic sources of information were accessible in the works of Celticists who claimed to present King Arthur as he appeared before he was "touch'd by the adulterous finger" of a later age. Nor is direct evidence lacking. Even in boyhood, when, as the poet himself tells us,[2] he first lighted upon Malory, Tennyson was investigating in modern treatises and original sources the poetry and history of the ancient Celts. Inspired by the newly revived Ossianic controversy, he dipped into Macpherson's "Dissertation concerning the Poems of Ossian,"[3] and "The Druid's Prophecies," written

[1] Contrary to the general impression, Tennyson, according to his own statement, was not fond of romances and, in fact, prior to 1853 had never read through even the *Morte Darthur*. See *Alfred Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by His Son*, 1897, I, 194. For an account of Tennyson's chief sources, see especially M. W. MacCallum, *Tennyson's Idylls of the King and Arthurian Story*, 1894; Walther Wüllenweber, *Über Tennysons Königsidylle The Coming of Arthur und ihre Quellen* (Marburg dissn.), 1889; Harold Littledale, *Essays on Lord Tennyson's Idylls of the King*, 1893; Richard Jones, *Growth of the Idylls of the King*, 1895. Cf. *Morte Darthur*, ed. Sommer, 1891, III 3, ff.

[2] *Mem.*, II, 128. Cf. *Mem.*, I, xii.

[3] See Tennyson's quotation in the note to "On Sublimity" (*Poems by Two Brothers*, 1827: Facsimile edition, 1893, p. 107). For the source, see Tauchnitz *Ossian*, 1847, p. 34. Another note (p. 72) shows that Tennyson had been reading Macpherson's

by Tennyson between the ages of fifteen and seventeen, was suggested by the description of the Roman slaughter of the druids on the Isle of Anglesey given in Tacitus' *Annales* (xiv. 30).[1]

In a manuscript sketch of an Arthurian composition written about 1833,[2] when Tennyson was borrowing books from the Cambridge University library and was studying hard,[3] the poet refers to "King Arthur's three Guineveres" and to "two Guineveres," which latter he interprets as "primitive Christianity" and "Roman Catholicism." No better evidence could be adduced of Tennyson's early acquaintance with Welsh Arthurian tradition. The source of the story that Arthur had three wives, each named Gwenhwyfar, is the so-called historical Welsh *Triads*,[4] several versions of which had appeared without translation in 1801 in the famous *Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales* (II, 1 ff.). As there is no evidence that Tennyson knew Welsh in 1833, he probably ran across the necessary information in one or both of two works which in his day were widely quoted and were regarded as indispensable to any serious investigator of British antiquities during the first half of the nineteenth century. They are William Owen's *Cambrian Biography: or*

"Dissertation concerning the Æra of Ossian" (*Ossian*, p. 11) or the Argument to "Comala." Tennyson's early poetry is full of Ossianic echoes. Late in life Tennyson branded Macpherson's work as "poor in most parts," but he still remembered certain of the finer passages. See *Mem.*, I, 256, n.; A. P. Graves, *Irish Lit'y and Musical Studies*, 1913, p. 9. In 1880, while in conversation with the Anglo-Irish poet William Allingham, he showed an acquaintance with genuine Ossianic tradition (*William Allingham, A Diary*, ed. H. Allingham and D. Radford, 1908, p. 298). He once told Alfred Perceval Graves that he much desired to write an Irish poem, and the latter sent him Joyce's *Old Celtic Romances* (1879), hoping that Tennyson would choose an Ossianic theme, preferably *Oisín i Tír na n-Óg* (Graves, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–9). The result was "The Voyage of Maeldune" (1880), in which, according to Hallam Tennyson (*Mem.*, II, 254), the poet attempted "to represent in his own original way the Celtic genius." Although Tennyson's interest in Ireland was largely political, he, like Renan and Arnold, believed in the superior poetic genius of the Celt (*Mem.*, II, 338), and some of his most famous lines were inspired by Irish scenes and events. See further Henry Van Dyke, *Selections from Tennyson* (Ath. Press), p. xxxvii; *Tennyson and his Friends*, ed. Hallam, Lord Tennyson, 1911, pp. 144 f.; *Letters of William Allingham*, ed. H. Allingham and E. B. Williams, 1911, *passim*.

[1] *Poems by Two Brothers*, p. 69. Cf. Cambridge *Tennyson*, p. 762, and "Boädicea" (1859), *ibid.*, pp. 266 ff.

[2] *Mem.*, II, facing p. 123.

[3] See *Mem.*, I, 124, 129, 130. Late in 1833 Tennyson received from Cambridge a copy of Thomas Keightley's *Fairy Mythology*, which had appeared in 1828. Keightley's work contains discussions of the fairy lore of many countries, including Ireland, Wales, and Brittany. Much of Keightley's material is drawn from T. Crofton Croker's *Fairy Legends and Traditions of the South of Ireland*, which Tennyson also knew and which he used in his poetry. Cf. Littledale, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, 129, 240, 281. For Tennyson's knowledge and use of William Carleton's *Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry*, see *Mem.*, II, 319, note.

[4] There are numerous series of triads. See Ferdinand Walter, *Das alte Wales*, 1859, pp. 9 ff., 36 ff.

Historical Notices of Celebrated Men among the Ancient Britons (1803),[1] and Edward Davies' *Mythology and Rites of the British Druids* (1809).[2] The former was a convenient handbook compiled, in part from unprinted sources, by an eminent authority and co-editor of the *Myvyrian Archaiology*, the latter based partly on original material and famous because of the helio-arkite mysteries supposedly unearthed by its learned author. The Gwenhwyfar tradition in Welsh gives special prominence to Arthur's second and third queens, of whom the latter is said to have betrayed her lord, whereas the former was especially beloved by him and was in consequence buried by his side at Glastonbury. The infidelity of one of Arthur's consorts, thus assumed in ancient Welsh tradition and set forth in greater detail in Lady Guest's notes (*Mab.*, Part I, 1838) and in the *Hanes Cymru* (1842),[3] furnished a strong incentive for Tennyson's retention of Malory's adulterous Gueneuer in spite of nineteenth-century prudishness.[4]

In the earliest preserved outline of an epic, written also about 1833, Tennyson describes "the sacred mount of Camelot," which he places "on the latest limit of the West in the land of Lyonesse, where, save the rocky Isles of Scilly, all is now wild sea."[5] When the poet removed Camelot from its traditional position inland[6] and

[1] *S.v.* Gwenhwyvar, p. 158. About 1806 Owen added the name Pughe to his former appellation. See his life in Robert Williams' *Enwogion Cymru* (1852), where, by the way, Tennyson could have confirmed his earlier impression that there were three Guineveres. In 1838 he could have found a reference to Arthur's three queens in the notes to Part I of Lady Guest's *Mabinogion*, and in 1842 in Villemarqué's *Contes populaires des anciens Bretons* (see p. 226 of *Les Romans de la Table Ronde et les Contes des anciens Bretons*, nouv. ed., 1861). See also Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, 1913, II, 250.

[2] Tennyson may conceivably have been acquainted with the complete translations of the Triads in William Probert's *Ancient Laws of Cambria* (1823, pp. 393, 410) and in Vols. I, II, and III of *The Cambro-Briton* (1820–22), but they are not so likely to have been known to him as the books by Owen and Davies.

[3] See also [Algernon Herbert] *Britannia after the Romans*, 1836, pp. 91 ff., where, as in Tennyson's note, ancient British tradition is interpreted allegorically. Cf. Thomas Stephens, *Literature of the Kymry*, 1849, p. 82. On Tennyson's knowledge of the *Hanes Cymru*, see infra, p. 490.

[4] Cf. Rhŷs, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, 1891, p. 49. [5] *Mem.*, II, 122.

[6] For various identifications of this illusive place, see Foerster, *Christian von Troyes sämtliche Werke*, 1899, IV, 362 *f.*; Howard Maynadier, *The Arthur of the English Poets*, 1907, p. 183, n.; Percy's *Reliques*, notes to "King Ryence's Challenge," where, in a passage quoted from Stow's *Annales of England*, Camelot is described as "sometimes a famous towne or castle . . . . situate on a very high tor or hill." In 1839 Tennyson ran across an English poem on the flooding of a whole district of Wales through the carelessness of the drunken Seithenin—a story referred to in the Triads (cf. Probert, *op. cit.*, p. 393) and other Welsh documents (*Mem.*, I, 173). Later he doubtless read a full account of the catastrophe in the notes to Part VII (1849) of the *Mabinogion*. The tradition is referred to by Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 242, and Bingley, *North Wales*, 1804, II, 20. See also Camden, *Britannia* (Gough), 1806, I, 78, 91.

located it in the submerged district which, according to an oft-recorded tradition, once formed part of the peninsula of Cornwall,[1] he was doubtless actuated by reasons more cogent than a mere poetic fancy arising from the fact that in the source of "The Lady of Shalott" Camelot is placed near the sea.[2] In a conversation said to have taken place in 1860[3] Tennyson expressed the conviction that Arthur was an historical personage and that the original scene of his exploits was Cornwall, "though old Speed's narrative has much that can be only traditional." The book referred to is John Speed's *History of Great Britaine,* first published in 1611 as a continuation of the author's *Theatre of Great Britaine.* In connection with an extended discussion of the background of Arthurian tradition, Speed reaches the conclusion that the historical Arthur lived in Cornwall, adding, "*Tindagell Castle* . . . . first brought into the world this glorious *Prince,* . . . . and *Cambula* receiued his last bloud" (p. 317). Sharon Turner in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons,* with which, as we shall see in a moment, Tennyson was also acquainted, takes much the same position,[4] and Thomas Stephens[5] argues that the *mabinogion* which fix Arthur's seat and exploits in Cornwall are the earliest and asserts that "long after the rest of the world had turned their eyes to Caerlleon," the Welsh bards "persisted in confining him to Cornwall." In this connection it should be observed that, although Tennyson made several excursions into Wales,[6] his most extensive investigations of local antiquities appear to have been in Cornwall.[7] Especially important are the visits of 1848 and 1860. On the former occasion he discussed Arthurian matters with the poet-antiquarian Hawker and borrowed

[1] For early printed accounts of the submergence of Lyonesse, see Robert Hunt, *Popular Romances of the West of England,* a new impression, 1916, pp. 190 ff. See further Dunlop, *History of Fiction* (1814), American reprint of 2d London ed., 1842, I, 169. The legend of Lyonesse was current among Cornish fishermen of Tennyson's day (M. A. Courtney, *Cornish Feasts and Folk-Lore,* 1890, p. 67), and when Tennyson was cruising off the Land's End in 1887, he gazed into the depths of the sea, "searching, as he said, for some ruins of town or castle, parts of the ancient Lyonesse" (*Mem.,* II, 340).

[2] Cf. Cambridge *Tennyson,* p. 797.

[3] See *Memories of Old Friends, Being Extracts from the Journals and Letters of Caroline Fox,* ed. H. N. Pym, 1882, II, 274 f.

[4] See Vol. I, pp. 272 ff., of the 4th (1823) ed. The work appeared originally in parts between 1799 and 1805.

[5] *Op. cit.,* pp. 319, 416. Cf. *Cambrian Journal,* 1859, p. 337; Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poet,* ed. of 1871, I, 97.

[6] *Mem.,* I, 173, 222; II, 108, 125; "The Golden Year," Cambridge *Tennyson,* p. 86.

[7] *Mem.,* I, 274 ff., 460 f., 465 f., 513; II, 125, 340, 385; *Tennyson and His Friends,* pp. 145, 329, n.; Caroline Fox, *op. cit.,* II, 138 f., 274 f.

books and manuscripts about King Arthur, including R. J. King's *Fairy Mythology of Tintadgel*.[1]

The portrayal of Arthur as an ideal man, Tennyson justified from early documents, one at least of which he regarded as representing ancient Celtic tradition. In support of his position he cited the following passage from "an old writer:" "In short God has not made since Adam was, a man more perfect than Arthur."[2] The passage, as Hallam Tennyson indicates, is translated from the Welsh *Brut ab Arthur*, which the poet, in common with a number of respectable authorities of his day, regarded as the source rather than the pendant of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*.[3] After learning Welsh, Tennyson might have consulted the original in the *Myvyrian Archaiology* (II, 299: *Ac ar vyrder ni wnaeth Duw or pan vu Ada un dyn gwblach noc Arthur*); he actually found the translation in Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*.[4]

That Tennyson's reading before the publication of the first *Idylls* (1859) had led him into the domain of Breton tradition, is implied in a letter written in 1855 to the Breton poet Hippolyte Lucas.[5] When the laureate made an excursion into Brittany in 1864, he visited numerous places associated with Arthur.[6] He knew Renan, and when the author of *La poésie des races celtiques* called on Tennyson in London, the two discussed Breton antiquities.[7] While in Brittany, Tennyson made an unsuccessful effort to meet Villemarqué, and his remark to Renan that "Villemarqué est plus poète que savant" implies that he was acquainted at least with the unscrupulous Breton nobleman's *Barzaz-Breiz*,[8] a widely

[1] *Life and Letters of R. S. Hawker*, 1905, pp. 190 ff.; *Mem.*, I, 274. From Hawker, Tennyson appears to have derived the spelling "Dundagil," afterwards changed to "Tintagil" in line 292 of "Guinevere." Cf. *Idylls of the King*, 1859, p. 240. See further [R. H. Shepherd], *Tennysoniana*, 1866, p. 115, n.; *The Poetical Works of . . . Hawker*, 1899, p. 160; Camden, *Britannia* (Gough), 1806, I, 6.

[2] *Mem.*, I, 194; II, 128 f.

[3] For a balance of early opinion, see Stephens, *op. cit.*, pp. 307 ff. Cf. Walter, *op. cit.*, pp. 44 ff.; *Mem.*, II, 121, 129; Warton, *op. cit.*, I, 98.

[4] Ed. cited, I, 271, n. 13. The passage is lacking in Geoffrey's Latin (Book IX, chap. i)—a fact which may have strengthened Tennyson's conviction that the Welsh represents a more authentic tradition.

[5] *Mem.*, I, 385, n. 1.

[6] *Mem.*, II, 5, 232. That Brittany is the home of Arthurian tradition, was maintained by various authorities during the first half of the last century. See, for example, Dunlop, *op. cit.*, I, 137; De la Rue, *Essais historiques*, 1834, I, 63 ff.; Stephens, *op. cit.*, pp. 416 ff.; Thomas Wright, *Hist. of King Arthur*, 1858, I, v; Villemarqué, *Romans de la Table Ronde*, ed. cit., pp. 21 f.

[7] *Mem.*, II, 232; Francis Epinasse, *Life of Ernest Renan*, 1895, p. 74.

[8] First published in 1839. For other works of Villemarqué's which may have been known to Tennyson, see Littledale, *op. cit.*, p. 3, n. 43. An English translation of the *Barzaz-Breiz*, by Tom Taylor, appeared in 1865.

circulated collection of alleged Celtic traditional songs, some of which had been proved spurious by Luzel in 1872.[1]

The Welsh romance of *Geraint ap Erbin,* with an English translation and notes, was published in 1840 as Part III of Lady Guest's *Mabinogion,*[2] but it was not until the spring of 1856 that it was used by Tennyson[3] as the source of the idyll of "Enid."[4] By the summer of 1856 the poet, with the assistance of Welsh schoolmasters, had learned some Welsh, and according to his son,[5] he and his wife "now read together the *Hanes Cymru,* . . . . the *Mabinogion* and *Llywarch Hen.*" By the *Mabinogion* is of course meant Lady Guest's edition. The work first mentioned is the *Hanes Cymru, a Chenedl y Cymry, o'r Cynoesoedd hyd at Farwolaeth Llewelyn ap Gruffydd;* that is, "History of Wales and of the Welsh People, from Antiquity till the Death of Llewelyn ap Gruffydd." This book, written by the distinguished Welsh scholar and antiquarian Thomas Price, appeared in 1842, and, as it was compiled from original sources, some unprinted, it long remained the standard native authority on the early history of Britain. The third book read by Tennyson in his study of Welsh is *The Heroic Elegies and other Pieces of Llywarç Hen, Prince of the Cambrian Britons,* a collection of ancient Welsh poems accompanied by a translation and an introduction on the bardic system, and published in 1792 by William Owen, the compiler of the *Cambrian Biography.*[6] Tennyson's knowledge of Welsh was probably not extensive. Only in the case of the *Hanes Cymru* was he forced to translate his text without a "crib," and Price's book should occasion no trouble to one reasonably conversant with modern Welsh.[7]

[1] *De l'authenticité des chants du Barzaz-Breiz,* etc.

[2] Vol. I of the *Mabinogion* contains Parts I (1838) and II (1839); Vol. II, Parts III (1840), IV (1842), and V (1843); Vol. III, Parts VI (1845) and VII (1849). The three volumes were bound with separate title-pages dated 1849.

[3] For Tennyson's use of other *mabinogion,* see Littledale, *op. cit.,* pp. 133 f.; see also p. 75.

[4] *Mem.,* I, 414 f. [5] *Mem.,* I, 416.

[6] Tennyson may have learned of the *Hanes Cymru* and *The Heroic Elegies* from Lady Guest's notes to *Geraint* (*Mab.,* II, 145, 151), where both are referred to. They are frequently cited by early nineteenth-century writers on the Celts.

[7] Between 1856 and 1859 Tennyson discovered "that the 'E' of 'Enid' was pronounced short (as if it were spelt 'Ennid')" (!) and accordingly changed "wedded Enid" in line 4 of the earlier version to "married Enid" as it now appears in "The Marriage of Geraint" (*Mem.,* II, 125, n. 2). On the point, see *Dosparth Ederyn Davod Aur,* tr. John Williams, ab Ithel, 1856, p. 5, where just this pronunciation is given for

Tennyson completed the original draft of "Merlin and Nimuë" in March, 1856. As is implied in the legend *Enid and Nimuë: The True and the False*, which appeared on the title-page of the earliest volume of *Idylls*, printed in 1857,[1] Tennyson's choice of the story of "Enid" as his next subject was partly determined by the contrast between the heroine and the guileful nymph of the preceding idyll. There is, however, another and an equally cogent reason why Tennyson should have felt that no Arthurian epic ought to lack an account of Geraint. Not only must Tennyson's avowed faith in a historical Arthur[2] have found strong confirmation in Price's twelve-page discussion of that hero, but the poet must have been impressed with the Welsh scholar's explicit assertion that no history of Arthur should disregard Geraint.[3] According to the *Marwnad Geraint ab Erbin*, published in the *Heroic Elegies*[4] and quoted in part in the *Hanes Cymru*, Geraint perished while serving with Arthur in the battle of Llongporth, a tradition which, although lacking in the *mabinogi* of *Geraint*, Tennyson utilized in the last two lines of "Enid" as first written.[5]

One of the most far-reaching and as yet neglected influences during the Romantic revival of British antiquities emanated from a collection of Welsh material of various ages and degrees of trustworthiness, made during the late eighteenth century by Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg) and printed in various books, notably

---

early Welsh *e*. For the correct value, see John Strachan, *An Introduction to Early Welsh*, 1909, p. 2. That modern Welsh *e* may be either long or short, Tennyson might, of course, have learned from any one of several grammars. The fanciful etymology of *Nimuë* referred to by Tennyson (*Mem.*, II, 366), I have been unable to run down. It suggests the discussion of "*nynu*, to kindle," in John Williams' *Gomer, Second Part*, 1854, p. 57. See further Miss Paton, *Radcliffe Coll. Monog.*, XIII, 240 ff.

[1] But not published. Cf. *Mem.*, I, 418, 436. On the bibliography of the *Idylls*, see Jones, *op. cit.*, 45 ff., 159 ff.; T. J. Wise, *A Bibliography of . . . . Tennyson*, 1908, pp. 148 ff., 161, 241.

[2] *Mem.*, II, 121, 129. Tennyson's belief was of course shared by a long line of authorities. Cf. Owen, *Camb. Biog.*, pp. 13 ff.; R. H. Fletcher, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, IX, *s.v.* Arthur in Index.

[3] The passage in Price's account runs: *Yn mhlith y gwronion o'r ardaloedd yma, nid cyfiawn fyddai annghofio enw Geraint ab Erbin, yr hwn oedd dywysog o'r dalaeth a elwid Dyfnaint, [Devon] a'r hwn a elwir yn y Trioedd, yn un o'r "Tri Llynghesawg ynys Brydain"* (*Hanes Cymru*, p. 275). Geraint had already been treated as historical by Owen (*Camb. Biog.*, p. 130), by Davies (*op. cit.*, p. 379, note), and by Turner (*Vindication*, pp. 172 ff.) See also *Cambrian Register*, 1818, p. 210.

[4] Printed also in the *Myvyrian*, I, 101; Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, 1868, I, 266 ff.; II, 37 ff.

[5] See Nicoll and Wise, *Lity. Anecdotes of the Nineteenth Century*, 1896, II, 233.

in the *Myvyrian Archaiology*, the *Cyfrinach Beirdd Ynys Prydain* (1829), the *Iolo Manuscripts* (1848), and a volume entitled *Barddas; or a Collection of Original Documents, Illustrative of the Theology, Wisdom and Usages of the Bardo-Druidic System of the Isle of Britain*, the latter published in 1862 with a translation and notes by the Rev. John Williams ab Ithel, whose too ready acceptance of Iolo Morganwg's documents irritated Matthew Arnold. The last-named work is probably the *Barddas*[1] of which the first volume came into Tennyson's possession in 1867.[2] Both *Barddas* and the *Iolo Manuscripts* give prominence to the oft-quoted bardic motto, *Y gwir yn erbyn y byd* (the truth against the world),[3] which Tennyson claimed as his favorite and in 1868 had prominently emblazoned on the threshold of Aldworth.[4] In 1869 he recommended it as "a very old British apothegm" to the Tennyson Society of Philadelphia,[5] and in "Harold" (published 1876) he put it into the mouth of the hero (II, ii, 218).

In 1881, according to J. C. Walters,[6] Tennyson was elected vice-president of the Welsh National Eisteddfod.

Most of the books used by Tennyson overemphasize the antiquity of bardic tradition and in some cases their conclusions are vitiated by fantastic theories regarding the philosophy and religion of the ancient Celts,[7] but the important fact which triumphantly emerges from the material presented above is that Tennyson made an honest effort to ground his *Idylls* on the most reputable authorities of his day.

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Apparently no more were published.

[2] *Mem.*, II, 49 f. Tennyson's way of referring to the book makes it likely that this is the work meant rather than R. J. Prys's *Barddas y Cymry*, Part I, 1851. Cf. *Arch. Cambr.*, N.S., III, 160.

[3] Also quoted by Owen, *Heroic Elegies*, p. xxv, and by Price, *Hanes Cymru*, pp. 49 f.

[4] See *Tennyson and His Friends*, p. 250; H. J. Jennings, *Lord Tennyson*, 1884, p. 197.

[5] *Mem.*, II, 91.

[6] *Tennyson: Poet, Philosopher, and Idealist*, 1893, p. 359.

[7] See Stephens, *op. cit.*, *passim*, and D. W. Nash, *Taliesin, or the Bards and Druids of Britain*, 1858.

SOME ALLUSIONS TO RICHARD TARLETON

A few references to Tarleton which Halliwell and Hazlitt failed to note in their editions of the *Jests* may prove of interest to students of the drama, especially in view of Mr. W. J. Lawrence's recent and stimulating discussion of the famous clown.[1]

1. O fustie worlde! Were there anie commendable passage to Styx and Acharon I would go live with Tarleton.—*Returne from Parnassus* Part I (1597?), I, i.

2. . . . . as farre unfit for their profession, as Tarletons toyes for Paules Pulpit: betwixt which, though I make a comparison, yet to the place I reserue a reuerend regarde.—J. M., *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Seruingmen* (1598), Sig. B 3.

3. When Tarlton clown'd it in a pleasant vaine,
And with conceites, did good opinion gaine
Upon the Stage, his merry humors shop.
Clownes knew the Clowne, by his great clownish slop.
But now th' are gull'd, for present fashion sayes,
Dick Tarltons part, gentlemens breeches playes.
—Samuel Rowlands, *Knave of Hearts* (1600), Epigram 30.

4. It is not amisse sometimes to goe from home, to heare what newes there is at home; as *Tarlton* told the Queene, hee was going to *London*, to heare what newes at court.—R. Junius, *The Drunkard's Character* (1638), p. 669.

5. Give room ye Ghosts of *Tarlton*, *Scoggin*, *Summers*,
Minerva's Masquers, and the Muses Mummers.
—S. F., "On the Death of Archee the late Kings Jester," *Sportive Funeral Elegies* (1656).

More significant is the extemporal poem on the subject "Wher's Tarleton?" in *Quips upon Questions* (1600) by "Clunnyco de Curtanio Snuffe" (i.e., John Singer?):

6. One askes where *Tarleton* is, yet knowes hee's dead,
Foole, sayes the other, who can tell thee that?
Asse, quoth the first, I can: bow downe thy head,
Lend but an eare and listen. Sir, to what?
Ist come to Sir, quoth he, euen now twas Foole,
One Asse can with an other beare much rule.

[1] "On the Underrated Genius of Dick Tarleton," *London Mercury*, May, 1920.

Well, Asse or Foole, the second sayes, go on:
I say hee's dead. I true, and so say I.
And yet a liues too, though some say hee's gon.
Till you approue this, I must say you lie.
Lie, quoth the first, the stab with that must go,
I do not say you lie, I say I must say so.

A Collier after *Tarletons* death did talke,
And sayd, he heard some say that he was dead:
A simple man that knew not Cheese from Chaulke,
Yet simple men must toyle in wise mens stead.
Vnto the Play he came to see him there,
When all was done, still was he not the nere.

He calles a loude, and sayd that he would see him,
For well he knew it was but rumourd prate:
The people laught a good, and wisht to free him,
Because of further mirth from this debate.
The Collier sayd, the squint of *Tarletons* eie,
Was a sure marke that he should neuer die.

Within the Play past, was his picture vsd,[1]
Which when the fellow saw, he laught aloud:
A ha, quoth he, I knew we were abusde,
That he was kept away from all this croude.
The simple man was quiet, and departed,
And hauing seene his Picture, was glad harted.

So with thy selfe it seemes, that knowes he's dead,
And yet desires to know where *Tarleton* is:
I say he liues, yet you say no; your head
Will neuer thinke, ne yet beleeue halfe this.
Go too, hee's gone, and in his bodyes stead,
His name will liue long after he is dead.

So, with the Collier, I must thinke he liues,
When but his name remaines in memorie;
What credite can I yeelde to such repreeues,
When at the most, tis but vncertaintie.
Now am I a foole in deed? So let that passe,
Before I goe, Ile quit thee with the asse.

What, is his name Letters, and no more?
Can Letters liue, that breathe not, nor haue life?

[1] Note the use of Tarleton's picture in Wilson's *Three Lords and Three Ladies of London.*

No, no, his Fame liues, who hath layde in store
His actes and deedes: therefore conclude this strife,
Else all that heare vs, striue and breed this mutenie,
Will bid vs keepe the Colliar foole for company.

Well, to resolue this question, yet say I,
That *Tarletons* name is heare, though he be gone.
You say not, Whers his Body that did die?
But, where is *Tarleton?* Whers his name alone?
His Name is heere: tis true, I credite it.
His Body's dead, few Clownes will haue his wit.

QUIP:

Though he be dead, dispaire not of thy wisedome,
What wit thou hast not yet, in time may come:
But thus we see, two Dogges striue for a bone,
Bout him that had wit, till them selues haue none.

Even more interesting is the passage in Henry Peacham's essay "Of Parents and Children" found in his *The Truth of Our Times*[1] (1638). In discussing the incorrect method of handling the prodigal he uses the following illustration:

7. I remember when I was a School-boy in London, Tarlton acted a third sons part, such a one as I now speake of: His father being a very rich man, and lying upon his death-bed, called his three sonnes about him, who with teares, and on their knees craved his blessing, and to the eldest sonne, said hee, you are mine heire, and my land must descend upon you, and I pray God blesse you with it: The eldest sonne replyed, Father, I trust in God you shall yet live to enjoy it yourselfe. To the second sonne, (said he) you are a scholler, and what profession soever you take upon you, out of my land I allow you threescore pounds a yeare towards your maintenance, and three hundred pounds to buy you books, as his brother, he weeping answer'd, I trust father you shall live to enjoy your money your selfe, I desire it not, &c. To the third, which was Tarlton, (who came like a rogue in a foule shirt without a band, and in a blew coat with one sleeve, his stockings out at the heeles, and his head full of straw and feathers) as for you sirrah, quoth he) you know how often I have fetched you out of Newgate and Bridewell, you have beene an ungracious villaine,

[1] This collection of fourteen essays deserves to be better known. In addition to the numerous autobiographical passages (cf. pp. 13, 26, 39, 41, 47, 53, 71, 92, 123) it discusses certain matters in a manner quite modern. It explodes various popular errors of the time in the manner of Sir Thomas Browne, pleads for the higher pay of schoolmasters, puts forth some uncommonly sane suggestions regarding the education of boys, discusses at some length the pecuniary dangers confronting the authors of "good" books, gives some good advice, based on personal observation and experience, concerning traveling, etc.

I have nothing to bequeath to you but the gallowes and a rope: Tarlton weeping and sobbing upon his knee (as his brothers) said, O Father, I doe not desire it, I trust in God you shall live to enjoy it your selfe [pp. 103–5].

It is possible that this old play in which Tarleton made such an impression upon the youthful mind of his auditor is another instance of the dramatic treatment in England of the prodigal son motif.[1] The passage is interesting in other respects. It argues that Tarleton was apparently rather careful with respect to his make-up, and shows that, if *The Hundred Merry Tales*, as Hazlitt thinks entirely possible, had fallen into disrepute in higher quarters about 1582, at least one popular actor of the time did not hesitate to present a scene taken from the old jest-book; for the episode described by Peacham is obviously based upon the jest "Of the syk man that bequethyd hys thyrd son a lytell ground with the galows," as it is titled in Dr. Oesterley's edition of the *Tales*—the imperfect "Of the ryche man and his two sonnes" of Hazlitt's edition.

THORNTON S. GRAVES

TRINITY COLLEGE, NORTH CAROLINA

[1] In this connection a Scottish reference to a drama dealing with the prodigal son may be cited, since it has not, I believe, been noted by students of the stage. Cox in his *Sabbath Laws*, p. 299, states that the following entry, dated July 1, 1574, occurs in the Kirk-Session of St. Andrews: "The said day, anent the supplication given by Mr. Patrick Auchinlek, for procuring licence to play the comedy mentioned in St. Luke's Evangel of the Forlorn Son [the Prodigal Son], upon Sunday, the 1st day of August next to come." Several members of the Kirk were appointed to examine the play, and if it met with their approval, it was to be allowed, provided it did not draw people away from services either in the forenoon or afternoon.

NEW LIFE-RECORDS OF CHAUCER
ADDENDUM

As a supplement to the note which I printed in 1918 (*Modern Philology*, XVI, 49 ff.), containing transcripts of two Chancery warrants relating respectively to Chaucer's appointment in 1374 to the offices of controller of the custom and subsidy of wools, etc., and controller of the petty custom, and to the permission given to Thomas Evesham in 1377 to act as Chaucer's deputy in the former office, I give below the original texts of two corresponding patents, of which in my former note I could give only the abstracts contained in the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*.

Patent Rolls, 48 Edward III, Part I, membrane 13.

pro Galfrido Chaucer

Rex Omnibus ad quos etc. Sciatis quod concessimus dilecto nobis Galfrido Chaucer officia tam contrarotulatoris custume et subsidij lanarum coriorum et pellium lanutarum quam Contrarotulatoris parue custume vinorum ac trium denariorum de libra necnon pannorum et aliarum mercandisarum quarumcumque custumabilium per Mercatores tam indigenas quam alienigenas nobis debitorum in portu Londonie Habenda quamdiu nobis placuerit percipiendo in officiis illis tantum quantum alij Contrarotulatores custumarum in portu predicto[1] hujusmodi hactenus percipere consueuerunt Ita quod idem Galfridus rotulos suos dicta officia tangentes manu sua propria scribat et continue moretur ibidem et omnia que ad officia illa pertinent in propria persona sua et non per substitutum suum faciat et exequatur Volentes quod tam altera pars sigilli nostri quod dicitur Coket quam altera pars alterius sigilli nostri pro paruis custumis deputati in portu predicto in custodia predicti Galfridi remaneant quamdiu officia habuerit supradicta In cuius etc. Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium viij die Junij.

per breue de priuato sigillo.

Patent Rolls, 51 Edward III, membrane 14.

De deputato Contrarotulatoris deputato.

Rex Omnibus ad quos etc. salutem. Sciatis quod cum dilectus nobis Galfridus Chaucer Contrarotulator custume et subsidiorum lanarum coriorum et pellium lanutarum ac aliarum rerum custumabilium in portu Ciuitatis nostre Londonie sepius in obsequio nostro in partibus remotis occupatus existit Ita quod super excercicio officij predicti continue in persona sua morari non valeat Ac idem Galfridus dilectum nobis Thomam de Euesham ad dictum officium Contrarotulatoris loco ipsius Galfridi in absencia sua

[1] "in portu predicto" is interlined.

excercend*um* sub se deputau*er*it vt accepim*us* Nos ex causa p*re*dic*ta* volum*us* et concedim*us* q*uo*d idem Thomas officiu*m* p*re*dict*um* loco ipsius Galfr*i*di quociens ips*um* abesse contig*er*it faciat et exequat*ur* *et* rotulos d*ic*ti officij manu sua p*ro*pria scribat in forma debita *et* consueta q*uam*diu nob*is* *et* eidem Galfr*i*do placu*er*it. In cui*us* etc. T*este* vt supra.[1]

p*er* bill*am* Thesaurarii.[2]

No other documents have been found which relate to the matters dealt with in these two patents, but the full text of the patents themselves furnishes us with some details that are not included in the abstracts.

The patent of 48 Edward III (1374) contains the usual stipulation that Chaucer write the rolls pertaining to the offices with his own hand and execute his duties in person and not by a substitute; this stipulation is contained also in the Chancery warrant of the same date.

The patent of 51 Edward III (1377) is not undated (as I stated in my former note), but is dated May 10.[3] The words *quociens ipsum abesse contigerit* (not represented in the abstract or in the Chancery warrant of 1377) might be taken to indicate that the permission Chaucer received to depute Evesham to execute the duties of his office amounted practically to a permission to execute the office regularly by deputy. It is clear, however, that the permission given Chaucer on May 8 had immediate reference to Chaucer's absence from England between February 17 and March 25, 1377, and to his departure again for France on April 30 immediately following.[4]

SAMUEL MOORE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[1] "T*este* R*ege* apud Westm*onasterium* x die Maij."

[2] For these transcripts I am indebted to the kindness of Edward Salisbury, Esq., of the Public Record Office.

[3] See note 1 above.

[4] *Life-Records of Chaucer*, Document 101, p. 203.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Pearl. Edited by Charles G. Osgood, Jr. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1906.

A Good Short Debate between Winner and Waster. Edited by Sir Israel Gollancz. London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press, 1920.

Within the last fourteen years the study of Middle English literature has been furthered by a series of editions of the most important alliterative poems in inexpensive, carefully annotated form. Osgood's *Pearl* (which was preceded by the edition of Gollancz, 1891) has been followed by Gollancz' editions of *Patience*, 1913, *The Parliament of the Three Ages*, 1915, and *Winner and Waster*, 1920, Björkmann's *Mort Arthure*, 1915, Hanford and Steadman's *Death and Liffe*, 1918, and Robert J. Menner's *Purity* (i.e., *Cleanness*), 1920. Thus only a few of the most interesting texts, such as *The Siege of Jerusalem*, *St. Erkenwald*, and *Gawain and the Green Knight*, remain inedited. Of the editions cited Osgood's *Pearl*, which is extensively used in colleges and universities and which received only brief mention in the philological journals at the time of its appearance, and Gollancz' *Winner and Waster* deserve attention because their defects emphasize certain important principles of text-editing.

In Professor Osgood's *Pearl* the Introduction concisely and interestingly discusses such subjects as the manuscript, date, dialect, origins, and literary qualities of the poem. Though one might cavil at some of the judgments there expressed, especially, in view of Professor Schofield's well-established arguments, at the autobiographical interpretation of the poem, and at the editor's easy acceptance of Trautmann's "proof" of identity of authorship of *Gawain and the Green Knight*, *Pearl*, *Cleanness*, and *Patience* (*Anglia*, *I*, 109–46), this introduction is in the main satisfactory. Osgood's treatment of the text, also, is sound. His footnotes give all the readings of earlier editions and the emendations suggested by scholars, but his text generally follows the manuscript scrupulously, making only minor alterations. In but one case does he attempt a violent alteration: in line 197 he changes *beau uiys* to *bleaunt of biys*. There is obviously no likelihood that the manuscript reading is a mistake for a phrase so entirely different in appearance. Hence in making it the editor is really rewriting his text rather than attempting to restore an original reading. By a series of oversights Professor Osgood has failed to make the best connections with the edition of Gollancz. Thus the emendation *besternays*, line 307, was suggested by Gollancz (p. 115

of his edition) but is not credited to the earlier editor. Again in his note to line 115 Osgood states that Gollancz in an article accepted Morris' definition of *strothe* but does not say that in his edition Gollancz rejected that meaning and offered a new one (p. 111). The note to line 459 is interesting: "naule. G., regardless of phonology, sense or poetic delicacy, renders 'navel' (OE. nafola)." The meaning of the remark so far as it affects phonology is not clear, because *naule* is easily derived from OE. *nafola*, but cannot phonetically be derived from OE. *nægel* (Osgood's etymon). The editor's ideas of "poetic delicacy" were evidently the guiding force of his choice; "navel" is undoubtedly right. In other cases, particularly in the explanation of difficult words, Professor Osgood has silently rejected meanings given by Gollancz which are decidedly preferable to his own: e.g., it is inconceivable that *whatez* (l. 1041), riming with *fatez* (l. 1038) and *datez* (l. 1040), is *watz*, preterite of the verb *to be*. Perhaps Gollancz' interpretation is far-fetched, but at least it is phonetically possible. Possibly the word is ON. *hvetja*, "to incite," which according to a remark by Egilsson, *s.v. hvata*, seems to have had a "Norwegian" form in *a*. In his glossary Osgood gives for *agrete* (l. 560) "for the job" without indicating its etymology; Gollancz (p. 120) refers it to the Old French *á gret*, "according to mutual agreement."

In the Glossary, however, lies the great weakness of Professor Osgood's edition. Though the fullness of its references and the statement of derivations are admirable features, the meanings assigned to words are entirely unreliable. Of course the majority of the words are correctly defined. But inserted among the correct definitions are many meanings *ad locum*. Consequently a person not thoroughly familiar with Middle English (and only such a person needs a glossary) would by using this glossary fail to see the figurative and even at times violently wrenched meanings which the author of *Pearl* employed. Thus *apert* means primarily "openly," not "frankly"; *balke* means "the strip of unplowed land between two fields," not "mound (of a grave)"; *bolde* means "bold," not "shameless" (!); *bylde* means "build," not "cause to spring up"; *chere* means "face," not "demeanor"; *consciens* means "consciousness," not "conviction"; *dylle* means "dull, foolish," not "slow"; *empryse* means "enterprise," not "glory"; *faste* means "fast, firm," not "hard" or "in haste"; *flet* means "floor of a hall," not "ground"; *frayne* means "ask," not "desire"; *grow* means "grow," not "issue"; *ledden* means "speech, voice," not "sound of many voices"; *mete* means "food," not "act of eating"; etc. It is interesting to note that in one case at least Dr. Menner has observed this defect of Osgood's glossary; in commenting on Osgood's translation of a passage he says: "But this interpretation necessitates a violent wrenching of the meaning of *endure*, which means not 'avail' or 'be equal to a task' (Osgood's glossary) but 'suffer, bear'" (*Purity*, p. 73). The ultimate force of a word in a given passage may be that stated by Professor Osgood, but it may have reached that meaning

through some figure or extension which the reader of the poem should feel. In addition to this gravest fault, there are many minor slips in the Glossary: e.g., page 109, *OF. on efen* should read *OE. on efen;* page 111, *stecan* should be *stecian;* page 122, the derivation of *comfort* is omitted; page 174, *restay . . . . pres 3 pl. restayed*, should read *pret.* In other cases Professor Osgood gives dubious etymologies: e.g., *dyze* and *derþe* are probably English rather than Scandinavian in derivation, and *ruful* is probably English rather than French. Two words of the form *breme* appear; they are one word, from OE. *breme* meaning "famous," then "proud," "self-assertive." A remark appended to the definition of *lede*, "man," "used to address a dependent or an inferior," is probably wrong: the word is applied to Gawain in *Gawain and the Green Knight*, line 540.

Aside from the minor errors just noted, observation of Professor Osgood's glossary shows the necessity of giving primary meanings of words and, in cases where a secondary, derived, or figurative meaning is necessary, of stating that only after the primary meaning.

Professor Gollancz' edition of *Winner and Waster* is the third of his series of "Select Early English Poems." Like its predecessors, it contains a preface which discusses manuscript, authorship, date, and similar subjects. It then gives text, translation, notes, and glossary. In the various parts of the book Professor Gollancz has done much to make this striking poem understandable. But his treatment of the text is quite out of keeping with his previous work as editor and directly contradictory to the principles set down in the books on text-criticism and followed by the best modern editors. To put the matter briefly: in a poem of 503 lines he has made some 130 emendations. Moreover, as the manuscript readings are not recorded at the foot of the pages, but on two unnumbered sheets near the end of the book, the reader cannot readily see how much the editor has deviated from his manuscript in any given place. Professor Gollancz justifies his free treatment of this text by certain statements in his Preface (p. 1): "The scribe must have copied *Wynnere and Wastoure* from a manuscript illegible in many parts. A minute study has revealed an unexpectedly large number of errors due to corruption, misreading, substitution of words and other causes. . . . . The task of dealing with the many errors has necessitated very bold treatment of the text, as may be seen from the long list of emendations." Let us see whether so large a number of emendations was necessary.

In many cases Professor Gollancz introduces an emendation apparently for metrical reasons: e.g., line 26, *and japes [can] telle;* line 73, *ane hat[e]full beste* (MS *hatlfull*); line 77, *in quart[e]res foure;* line 158, *with bokel[e]s twayne;* line 194, *bow[e]men many;* line 266, *in wyntt[e]res nyghttis;* line 340, *quart[e]red swannes.* The first four and the sixth of these as they appear in the manuscript contain five syllables (including final *e*). Are five syllables too few for a second half-line? Apparently not, for Professor Gollancz has allowed half-lines of five syllables to stand in his text in lines

46, 52, 61, 156, 157, 179, 335, 476, and many others. In the fifth case four syllables seem to be too few. Yet in lines 65, 144, 356 we find but four syllables. Perhaps it is not number of syllables that determines Professor Gollancz' action, but arrangement. As any possible arrangement of syllables seems to be found in alliterative poetry, however, it is certainly not justifiable to alter a text for that reason. If grammatical considerations caused Professor Gollancz to insert the *e* in such cases, he does not follow them consistently; note *wondres* (l. 84), *prechours* (l. 169), *bocled* (l. 182). In other cases Professor Gollancz seems to have emended to "restore" alliteration to a line. Examples are lines 79, 121, 314, 369, 386. Two objections may be made to this practice: (1) as practically all alliterative poems contain some lines lacking in alliteration it may be that authors regarded themselves as free to insert such a line occasionally; (2) though a clever editor can alter one word so as to make alliteration, he can have no certainty that he has altered the right one or that he has chosen the right synonym for it; hence such emendations perhaps improve a poem but do not restore the author's reading. In other cases Gollancz has emended so as to get two alliterations in the first half-line: e.g., in line 266 he changes *In playinge and in wakinge* to *In [wraxl]inge and in wakynge;* in line 277 he inserts *te, And thou wolle[te] to the tauerne.* See also lines 125, 132, 177. Yet he leaves lines 103 and 476 with but a single alliteration in each half-line. Any acquaintance with alliterative verse shows that such half-lines are not infrequent, and hence emendation is entirely unwarranted. In a third type of cases Gollancz apparently does not recognize a permitted alliteration of *c* with *g*, and *s* with *sch*, and emends, as in line 275 (see K. Schumacher, *Studien über den Stabreim in der m.e. Alliterationsdichtung*, p. 129) and line 400 (compare l. 436 where he has retained the *s, sch* alliteration). It is to be remarked that Professor Gollancz emended for the same reasons in his second edition of *Parlement;* cf. lines 106, 113. If the purpose of emendation is to restore the text as the author wrote it, alteration is not justifiable in cases of the sort considered above.

In another series of cases Professor Gollancz changes the tense of a verb so as to avoid the alternation of the preterite and the historical present. Thus in line 37 he changes *threpen* to *threped;* line 125, *send* to *sendes;* line 177, *semyde* to *semyth;* line 187, *knewe* to *knowe;* etc. If Professor Gollancz applies this principle to his edition of *Gawain and the Green Knight* he will have a busy time regularizing tenses. As a matter of fact in *Winner and Waster* he occasionally leaves this mixture of tenses, e.g., in lines 121, 122. A casual reading of fourteenth-century literature shows that the authors used historical presents interchangeably with preterites.

In many instances where the text gives intelligible meaning Professor Gollancz emends because he thinks he can improve the sense: e.g., in lines 5 and 6 he changes *wyle* to *wylle* and *wyse* to *wyli;* yet "For now all is wit and wile that we deal with, wise words and sly," gives good sense. In line 22 he changes *wroghte* to *writen* though the poet's use of the expression *words*

wrought is verified by line 25. In line 10 he changes *when he hore eldes*, which looks like an old idiomatic phrase, "when he grows old and hoar," to the sophisticated *when he hore for eld es*. In line 15 he inserts *no* unnecessarily (again modernizing); for *boyes* is used contemptuously as in *Pearl* 806, and *Piers the Plowman*, B. XI, 197; while *blode* probably means "courage." In line 55 *alle* is changed to *als I* very improbably. *Alle* means the people in general, members of the two armies and others, who would naturally prefer peace to war. The emendation makes it necessary to understand line 59 as meaning that as the dreamer watched some one raised up the cabin. In line 79 *out* makes perfect sense; the beasts were from the English coat of arms. In line 83 *kynge* is preferable to *knyghte;* the dreamer recognized the king from the besants on the cabin. Neither he nor the reader is in the least interested in the identity of the herald. In line 108 the alteration of *ȝis* (which, despite the note, makes natural sense) to *y serue* is obviously improper. Perhaps the poet would have written *y serue* had he thought of it, but certainly we have no reason to suppose that he did. In line 134 the MS reading *kynge ryche* makes sense; Gollancz' reading is more pointed, but it is unnecessary. In line 137 *segge* is doubtless addressed to the *reader* and need not be plural. Space limitations forbid giving more examples of unnecessary emendations. In the largest number of cases the manuscript reading can be made to give intelligible sense.[1]

In a few places, however, the manuscript is unsatisfactory, and in these Professor Gollancz has given very ingenious and probable emendations; indeed he cannot be praised too highly for such emendations as those by means of which he has given point and meaning to the descriptions of the banners. In line 144 *bulles* for *bibulles*, in line 157 *galegs* for *galeys* are almost certainly restorations of the author's text.

Brilliant as some of these emendations are and grateful as all students of Middle English literature must be to the man who made them, they do not justify the many unnecessary alterations made in the text of *Winner and Waster*. In fact this edition is a relapse to the free methods of text-editing of an earlier period or of such contemporary scholars as Holthausen. Our experience with the text of *Beowulf* and other frequently edited poems has shown that when we do not understand a passage the fault is more probably with us than with the manuscript; and hence only when we have the strongest reasons for supposing a scribal error should we emend. Some of us think we shouldn't do so even then. As such texts as *Winner and Waster* will never be read by anyone but a scholar, why not print the text diplomatically and in notes suggest emendations?

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO J. R. HULBERT

[1] Dr. J. M. Steadman, Jr., calls my attention to the fact that in a number of instances the emendations adopted by Gollancz were suggested by Schumacher (*op. cit.*, pp. 174–75) but are not credited to him. These appear in ll. 94, 132, 277, 369, 471. For other defects in Gollancz' edition, in particular a surprisingly large number of misreadings of the Manuscript, see Dr. Steadman's forthcoming review in *Modern Language Notes*.

A Study of Shakespeare's Versification, with an Inquiry into the Trustworthiness of the Early Texts, an Examination of the 1616 Folio of Ben Jonson's Works, and Appendices, Including a Revised Text of Antony and Cleopatra. By M. A. BAYFIELD. Cambridge: University Press, 1920. Pp. xii+521.

In essentials this is an important book. "Its purpose is," the Preface states, "first to give an intelligible and consistent account of the structure and characteristic features of his [Shakespeare's] dramatic verse." The intelligibility and consistency are marred by insistence on the wayward theory of a trochaic basis for English meter, previously set forth by the author, and by a profuse assumption of monosyllabic and often difficult polysyllabic feet. It seems to most students of English poetry that such *hora novissima*, thick-and-thin theories of verse are not only false but meaningless; that they are less sufficient than a simple description of all good verse, especially dramatic, as a weaving about a verse-norm of any sort of arabesque variant which leaves the norm still perceptible; that the usual norm, since English verse tends to begin with an unaccented and end with an accented syllable, is both in origin and actually what is called iambic; but that unless a poet is otherwise known to have followed some *ars poetica* of more rigid kind, all Procrustean, pseudo-classical schemes for his verse are as painful to the reader as they would have been to the poet. The older theories of prosody, to put the thing briefly, did not sufficiently recognize gradations, and erred by treating it in the manner of the mathematical and not the biological sciences. Herein Mr. Bayfield the classicist also errs. But his perverse theory, with all the arbitrary judgments and strong language[1] which go with it, is not essential to the fresh contribution made by his book. This, namely, is the proof that Shakespeare employed slurred three-syllable "feet" far more than has been recognized, and more than was usual in his day; that he employed them oftener and oftener; that the early editions, especially the First Folio, tend purposely to conceal or alter them; that such colloquial forms as "do't," "is't," used in the Folio for this purpose, are, however, not monosyllabic but merely indicate slurring. The last two points are well supported by examination of the quartos, of prose passages, and of the 1616 folio of Jonson. It is Shakespeare's preference for the fuller manner of recitation, Mr. Bayfield opines (p. 291), "which he had in his mind more than anything else when he made Hamlet say to the players, 'Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, *trippingly on the tongue.*'" Here we find Mr. Bayfield's second purpose, "to show that there are many thousands of lines of it [the poet's dramatic verse] that

[1] He brands as "rag-time scansions" (p. 10) such lovely or finished movements as that of Dante's

Dolce color d'oriental zaffiro,

and of Chaucer's

Liveth a lyf blisful and ordinat.

are given in modern texts not as their author intended them to be delivered, but clipped and trimmed," etc. Hereby he displaces the timid and conventional treatments of the subject by Fleay, Abbott, and less-known writers. The reader must grant him that the proportion of such extended feet, as to which he presents figures, affords at times a fresh kind of evidence for dating the plays, and that the reader and the actor should allow themselves more freedom than heretofore in pronouncing light syllables, however much such abbreviations as "on't," "i'th'," may be endeared by association. As to choosing printed forms, whether an editor should go counter to the wholesome modern tendency, more and more justified by bibilographical science, to stick to the early authorities, is another question. Of the fruitfulness of this minute study of the early editions, and of the influence of one or two eminent English exponents of it, this book is one more example, based though it is like Nebuchadnezzar's image. There is yet more infiltration of clay than I have shown; but there is also more iron, notably the attack (pp. 403 ff.) on Dowden's sentimental view as to Shakespeare's "period of gloom." There is iron enough to keep the book erect. It is a singular mixture of the amateurish and the doctrinaire with diligence, enterprise, and keenness.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

RECENT WORKS ON PHASES OF THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE

A brief appraisal is given here of a group of works in the field of the Renaissance in England or having a bearing upon it, in order that attention may be called, in the limited space available, to as many as possible of the recent studies that are important for the period.

A survey of the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe as a whole is attempted in the two volumes of Henry Osborn Taylor's *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1920). Of the five divisions of the work, the first is given to a study of the Renaissance in Italy from Petrarch and Boccaccio to Ariosto, with special chapters for the "publicists" and for the painters. The second records the movements in Germany that culminated in Erasmus and Luther. The third surveys those of France from Louis XI to Calvin with emphasis on a small number of outstanding figures. The fourth deals with England, elaborating—after a passing sketch of the educational thought and activity of the sixteenth century—Wycliffe's career, Lollardism in the fifteenth century, and the progress of the Reformation in its relation to the political problems of the sixteenth century from Tyndale to Hooker. It closes with succinct estimates and eulogies of a small group of men of action and of literary men as inspired voices of the great age. The fifth is concerned with the progress of philosophy and science in the period. The book will prove of real value both to the special student, who will find in it a large body of information in a compact

form, and to the general reader, who will get something of the sweep and complexity of the period and will grasp the significance of the great names without confusing them with those of secondary importance. It is marked by a clear presentation, a skilful digesting of abstract philosophies, and an enthusiasm for most of the great men and many of the phases of the Renaissance.

Unfortunately, however, stimulating as the book is, it fails to give a perspective that the present reviewer regards as essential for an adequate grasp of the meaning of the sixteenth century. The emphasis on the Reformation and its dramatic figures like Luther, Calvin, and Tyndale makes the work a study of the Reformation primarily, while the philosophy and science of the age as expressive of its thought are stressed above literature and the study of humanism. All this may be according to Mr. Taylor's estimate of relative values in the field, but no work proposing to survey all the important aspects of the sixteenth century should neglect the new ideals in education, culture, and literature. In stressing the continuance of the culture and learning of the Middle Ages the author rejects the term Renaissance in his title, and from the same point of view he ignores the significance of the fall of feudalism, of the spread of knowledge among the masses, of the new impulses to individualism, of the passion for fame and the accompanying efforts to acquire all knowledge and culture, and of the new conception of nobility as based on *vertu*, or the social worth and moral force of the individual—aspects that made the age one of real renascence despite its continuity with the Middle Ages. The educational works of the early Renaissance, the courtesy books later, and finally the treatises on special subjects like criticism and morals—barely touched upon by Mr. Taylor—represent a new contribution to thought even though based on the classics, and a new idealism that inspired much of the creative literature of the age and is constantly reflected in it. Hence the excellent sketches given of Spenser, Shakespeare, and their fellows would be more significant, at least for this work, if they were more closely related to the movements of contemporary thought. Again, a fuller and more sympathetic treatment of the ideals for reforming the church held by men like Colet and Erasmus is needed to round out the treatment of the religious thought of the period. For the vital force of the fanatical religious passion in Luther and his followers that stirs Mr. Taylor was not, for all of its dynamic quality, so significant for English thought and expression in the sixteenth century as was the humanistic reformer's ideal of the human race perfected through knowledge and reason. The Church of England, despite the constant struggle of the Puritans to take the helm, was on the whole guided by the humanists, whose religion, best expressed in the broad liberalism of Hooker, was closely related to the moral idealism of the great literary men of the century. Though the author recognizes what he calls the *via media* in the English religious movement, he fails to show the essential unity that underlay

the educational, cultural, religious, and literary movements in the England of Elizabeth, in spite of the chaotic forms of their expression and the increasing vehemence of the Puritan utterance.

For the background of the Reformation an able and important study is found in Miss Margaret Deanesly's *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920). Starting from Sir Thomas More's statement of the liberal attitude of the Catholic church toward the translation and study of the Bible, she reviews the history of Bible translation and study on the Continent from the twelfth century to Luther, and then devotes the major part of her volume to a similar survey for England from the Anglo-Saxon period to Tyndale, dealing with the education of the various classes of the clergy before Wycliffe, with the history of the Lollard movement, especially in relation to the Bible, and with the reading of the Bible among both the Lollards and the orthodox in the fifteenth century. Miss Deanesly has not only made a valuable study of the long preparation for the Reformation, but in her fresh investigation of the general state of culture from Chaucer to Tyndale she has thrown some light on the educational and social condition of England in the period of preparation for the Renaissance.

La Controverse de Martin Marprelate, 1588–1590 (Geneva: A. Jullien, 1916), by G. Bonnard, whether correct or not in all the details of its treatment of a vexed field, is a succinct and clear account, liberally documented, of the origin and progress of the Marprelate controversy. Starting with the theory that Throckmorton was the author of all the Martin tracts (see Appendix A for the argument), M. Bonnard follows the history of their production and of the replies of the anti-Martinists. The book closes with bibliographies of legal documents, of controversial tracts in chronological order, and of modern works bearing on the subject.

Among the works devoted to the poets and poetry of the period, an unusually important one is Frederick Morgan Padelford's edition of *The Poems of Henry Howard Earl of Surrey* recently published as the first of the University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature. The poems, classified according to subject-matter, include Tottel's text of Surrey's translation of the second and fourth books of the *Æneid*, and also the text of the fourth book from Hargrave MS 205. The critical material consists of a full sketch of Surrey's life, an estimate of his contribution to English verse, textual notes, critical notes dealing in detail with sources, bibliography, and glossary. All of this material is skilfully condensed, and the edition bears the marks of careful workmanship. It should long remain standard. Unfortunately there is some evidence in the notes especially of the crude work of a provincial typesetter. How far this affects the trustworthiness of the text I have not been able to determine.

In *Douglas' Æneid* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920) Lauchlan M. Watt studies the medieval and Renaissance influences that guided

Douglas his place and influence in the Renaissance, the nature of his translation, the history of his text, etc. The book is valuable for its survey of the early Renaissance in Scotland, one of the most important features of which was Douglas' attempt to make the Latin epic live again in Scottish vernacular poetry. Here he was in advance of the English poets, and he influenced Surrey's similar attempt for England. The subject, however, needs to be handled in a more exhaustive and constructive fashion than Mr. Watt has handled it, in spite of the fact that much of his material is telling and fresh. An adequate account of literary theory and practice in Scotland around 1500, of the extent to which it molded Douglas, and of the extent to which he contributed to the Renaissance in Scotland and England, will make one of the important chapters in the history of the early Renaissance.

Significance of another sort is attached to Hyder E. Rollins' volume of *Old English Ballads, 1553–1625* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920) in which are printed seventy-five ballads of the broadside type taken chiefly from manuscripts (especially from Add. MS 15225 and Sloane MS 1896 of the British Museum) and representing the uninspired muse of the religious controversies belonging to the middle of the sixteenth century. On the whole the ballads are inferior to most collections of broadsides that have been published, but their historical importance is considerable because the greater part of them represent uniquely the Catholic point of view. The introduction to the volume and the accounts prefixed to the separate ballads add greatly to the value of the book.

In *English Madrigal Verse 1588–1632* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1920) Edmund H. Fellowes brings together practically all of the verse published in the song books belonging to the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, when the excellence of music in England stimulated the production of a large body of song, much of it in the best vein of the Elizabethan and Jacobean lyric. Some of the verse in these song books is taken from the works of well-known poets; some of the rest for its excellence has been made accessible in one way or another and so is familiar; but a large body of fine poetry is here put within our reach for the first time. We are fortunate in having the material collected in a single volume so that it may be judged as a whole. Unfortunately Morley's *First Booke of Aires* was inaccessible to Mr. Fellowes (p. xx), and a keener regret will be felt by a large number of students of Elizabethan literature that he chose to omit all of Ravenscroft's volumes except *A Briefe Discourse*, on the ground that they are composed of rounds and folk-songs. The color of folk-song runs through many of the song books, and on that account alone Ravenscroft is needed to complete the collection even if he cannot be put definitely with one of the two classes—madrigalists and lutenists—into which Mr. Fellowes divides the song writers.

Still another phase of the poetry of the period around 1600 receives attention in *The Satire of John Marston* (Columbus, Ohio, 1920), by Morse S. Allen. This work is concerned with the personal satire arising from Marston's literary quarrels and with the satire directed against aspects of contemporary life and manners to be found in the plays as well as in the formal satires. There is basis for disagreement with the author in a number of details, especially on the treacherous ground of the literary quarrels or in his assignment of parts to the separate authors of a joint play or a revised play like *Histriomastix*. But the treatment as a whole, with its conservative handling of the quarrels of Marston and its full analysis of the range of his satire, furnishes a satisfactory sketch of the work of one of the most picturesque figures in a revolutionary decade.

In the field of the drama a notable general study is *English Pageantry, An Historical Outline*, by Robert Withington, in two sumptuous volumes (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918 and 1920). The numerous works devoted to the history of English drama or to types of dramatic literature have given a subordinate place to the pageant as a type, usually treating it as an embryonic form of the masque. This has been due to the fact that pageants are dependent on action and spectacle for their interest while the study of dramatic forms has been undertaken almost invariably from the point of view of literature. Professor Withington treats pageantry as a relatively distinct art with a distinct function in community life, and gives our first adequate history of English pageantry from its dim beginnings in the Middle Ages to the most finished modern efforts in communities of England and America. Following brief surveys, first, of the element of pageant to be found in games and processions of medieval festivals, and, second, of early tournaments, disguisings, and masques as related to pageants, an attempt is made to present fully the history of the "Royal Entry" in England from the end of the thirteenth century to the opening of the nineteenth, and of the most important form of civic pageant—the Lord Mayor's Show of London. These sections on the Royal Entry and the Lord Mayor's Show contain much fresh material and obviously are intended to include all available records, especially for the period down to the end of the seventeenth century. The final section deals with "Survivals and Revivals," "The Parkerian Pageant," which the author considers the important modern movement in the field, and "Pageantry in the United States." An excellent bibliography and an exceptionally full index are provided. I have noted several omissions of important accounts of pageantry in the Renaissance, as for example, the account of the elaborate midsummer pageants of 1521 in London given in the *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1520–6*, pp. 136–37, and that of the pageants presented before Queen Anne in 1613 at Wells, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, XVI, 318–21. But Professor Withington's work is worthy of high commendation for its fresh

contributions to the subject, for its survey of a large field, and for its interpretation of the pageant as a distinct type combining two art forms.

Among new editions of plays is the edition by Franck L. Schoell under the title *Charlemagne* (Princeton University Press, 1920) of the play from Egerton MS 1994 which Bullen edited as *The Distracted Emperor*. The purpose is to give a more correct text than the earlier one and to establish the authorship of Chapman which was suggested by Bullen. The account of Chapman's knowledge of Petrarch, whose *Epistolae* furnished the basis for *Charlemagne*, the excellent analysis of the style of the drama, and the pointing of numerous parallels between it and plays accepted in the Chapman canon make the ascription seem more than plausible. There is still a possibility, however, that the crudeness of the play, which is partly responsible for Professor Schoell's assigning the date 1598–99, is due to its having been written by an imitator of Chapman. In view of this it seems strange that verse tests were considered of so little value in comparison with tests of style and parallel passages that they are simply referred to as supporting the argument for Chapman's authorship and for the date assigned (p. 15). The matter should have been elaborated, for every possible bit of evidence is needed to establish the authorship of a play in a period like the Elizabethan when there was a free use of plots and incidents and a constant borrowing of aphorisms and striking poetic passages.

Two worthy examples of the modern college dissertation are the edition of Jonson's *Catiline His Conspiracy* in the Yale Studies in English (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), by Lynn H. Harris, from the text of the 1616 Folio of Jonson's works, and that of Massinger and Field's *Fatal Dowry* (Lancaster, Pa., 1918), a Princeton dissertation, by Charles L. Lockert, Jr., from the text of the early quarto, 1632. In the careful reproduction of the original texts with variant readings, in the study of such aspects of the history of the plays as date and source—and in the case of the *Fatal Dowry* the distribution of parts to joint authors—and in annotation, especially in indicating Jonson's constant classical borrowing, the editors have apparently done their tasks well. Both volumes will be welcomed as books of reference for the student of the Elizabethan drama.

Books on Shakespeare continue to multiply. An edition of his works is well advanced in "The Yale Shakespeare" published by the Yale University Press in a series of neat volumes, each given to a single play or other work edited by a member of the English faculty of Yale. The edition is a very practical one for students or libraries. The text with glossarial notes at the bottom of the pages comes first. Brief explanatory notes follow. The material dealing with sources of the plays, history of the text, etc., is usually given in appendixes at the end, which present in succinct form the established facts or generally accepted theories. In some cases, like Tucker

Brooke's edition of *I Henry VI* or S. T. Williams' edition of *Timon*, problems of source, authorship, etc., are treated somewhat more fully. A brief bibliography and an index conclude each volume.

Students of Shakespeare generally will welcome the reissue of so important a volume on the history of Shakespeare's text as Mr. Alfred W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of His Text* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920), which is now out of print in its first form. Mr. Pollard argues that "the Quartos regularly entered on the Registers of the Stationers' Company were neither stolen nor surreptitious," and has brought together "some little evidence that some at least of these editions may have been set up from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript" (p. 104). An introduction added in the new edition reviews the critical literature of the last ten or twelve years—much of it from Mr. Pollard's own pen—which has contributed new facts or new approaches to the study of the problems of Shakespeare's text. The book inaugurates a projected series by Mr. Pollard and Mr. J. Dover Wilson entitled "Shakespeare Problems."

Ludwig Tieck's *Buch über Shakespeare* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1920), the first of Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts, is edited by H. Lüdeke from manuscripts, with an introduction telling the story of Tieck's unrealized plans for a work of broad scope on Shakespeare. The various manuscripts, given here more fully than before, comprise notes made on Shakespeare's plays at the end of the eighteenth century—these cover 364 printed pages—several short collections of miscellaneous notes, including translations of scenes from English plays, Tieck's account of the plan for his book, and the two experimental chapters of an introduction written about 1815. The interest of the work is now almost altogether historical, and its chief value lies in the light it throws on Tieck rather than on Shakespeare.

In *The Position of the "Roode en Witte Roos" in the Saga of King Richard III* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Madison, 1919), Oscar J. Campbell prints from the Amsterdam edition of 1651 the Dutch play of Lambert van den Bos studied here, together with an English translation running at the bottom of the pages. In his introduction the editor presents detailed evidence to show that van den Bos, who translated a number of English works into Dutch, did not base his play on the chronicles or on Shakespeare, but had apparently some dramatic source as a result of which the play "shows resemblances to each of the extant Richard III plays—*Richardus Tertius*, *The True Tragedie of Richard the third*, and Shakespeare's *Richard III*—in respects in which they differ from each other and from the Chronicle sources" (p. 19). Further he argues that Shakespeare must "have known and used [the lost play], now and then,

to point material which he derived largely from Holinshed" (p. 57). While the evidence is not overwhelming, it is sufficient to make quite plausible the theory that the Dutch version reflects a lost play used by Shakespeare.

Elmer Edgar Stoll's *Hamlet: An Historical and Comparative Study* (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in Language and Literature, September, 1919) interprets the character of Hamlet in the light of tradition and of Elizabethan conventions as that of a man of resolution and reserve, well-poised, and bent on action. The study reflects a mind stored with knowledge of Shakespeare and Elizabethan literature generally, and hence is instructive and stimulating throughout. But the interpretation seems to me incorrect and the line of argument fallacious, despite the truth of much of the detail. For Professor Stoll, as I see it, would deny meaning to many a passage of *Hamlet* like "lapsed in time and passion" (III, iv, 107) and the speeches on suicide (I, ii, 129 ff., and III, i, 56 ff.), and for the text of Shakespeare as a basis of interpretation would substitute guesses as to what might be the correct stage-action by which the true Elizabethan conception of Hamlet could be determined. Every interpretation of the character, however, is a challenge to students of the problem, and we must give the author credit for a stout championship of the sturdy Hamlet of his conception.

In *The First Quarto of Shakespeare's Hamlet* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Madison, 1920) Frank G. Hubbard attempts to establish the fact that the First Quarto of *Hamlet* is not a pirated and garbled text but a complete copy of a consistent and effective version of the play (p. 32), which has been regarded too much in the light of the Second Quarto. His introduction sets forth this theory, based principally on the argument that the errors of the text are not of an extent and type unusual in Elizabethan printing. A modernized text of Q_1 is given with the errors corrected and the lines rearranged to indicate the true metrical lines, the present readings and arrangements of Q_1 being indicated in the footnotes. In presenting the case for the First Quarto in its best light, Professor Hubbard has made a valuable contribution toward the solution of one of the problems of Hamlet, but he can hardly be regarded as having solved it.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *February 1921* NUMBER 10

PACT AND WAGER IN GOETHE'S *FAUST*

It is the purpose of this investigation[1] to examine in their interrelation, the three fundamental passages of Goethe's *Faust* which deal directly with the terms of the agreements entered into by the Lord, Mephistopheles, and Faust.

The passages in question[2] are found in the *Prologue in Heaven* (especially ll. 312–43), in the so-called Pact Scene in *Studierzimmer II* (ll. 1635–1775, and more specifically 1692–1706), and in the Death Scene in *Grosser Vorhof des Palastes* (especially ll. 11573–95). They belong therefore to portions of the drama of which it is generally assumed that they date from the important third period of Goethe's activity on *Faust*, from June, 1797, to April, 1801, to which Goethe in old age refers as "die beste Zeit," when, aided by Schiller's encouragement and counsel, he again took up in earnest the work previously done and for a while even seemed to hope to be able to complete the entire drama.[3]

[1] An outline of the salient points of this paper was presented orally at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association at Columbus, Ohio, in December, 1919. For the sake of remaining within the limits of the available space, the paper as here printed has been somewhat condensed.

[2] Quotations and references follow the text of the Weimar edition.

[3] Only a few days before sending my manuscript to the printer I have received *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Goetheschen Faust* by Chr. Sarauw (Copenhagen, 1918; "Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser," I, 7.), of which I had previously seen Robert Petsch's extensive review, largely of assent, in *Germ.-Rom. Monatsschrift*, VIII (1920), 144–52. A necessarily hasty examination of Sarauw's arguments, of which I gladly admit that many are helpful and valuable, has however quite failed to convince me that practically the whole of the Pact Scene was

At that time (June 22, 1797), in an often quoted letter to Schiller, Goethe states that he is thinking over, first of all, the general "plan" or "idea" underlying the work.

Nun habe ich eben diese Idee und deren Darstellung wieder vorgenommen und bin mit mir selbst ziemlich einig.

Nevertheless he asks Schiller for suggestions on this point, and his more philosophically minded friend does not fail, in his reply of the very next day, to lay all possible emphasis on the necessity of bringing out clearly the central idea demanded by what he conceives to be the "symbolic significance" of the work as a whole.

Kurz, die Anforderungen an den "Faust" sind zugleich philosophisch und poetisch, und Sie mögen sich wenden, wie Sie wollen, so wird Ihnen die Natur des Gegenstandes eine philosophische Behandlung auflegen, und die Einbildungskraft wird sich zum Dienst einer Vernunftidee bequemen müssen.

In a subsequent letter of June 26, Schiller reverts to this point, stating,

dass mir der "Faust" seiner Anlage nach auch eine Totalität der Materie nach zu erfodern scheint, wenn am Ende die Idee ausgeführt erscheinen soll, und für eine so hoch aufquellende Masse finde ich keinen poetischen Reif, der sie zusammenhält. Nun, Sie werden sich schon zu helfen wissen.

Goethe, in his responses of June 24 and 27, is somewhat reserved in his references to his friend's suggestions. He points to the peculiarities of his own creative procedure so different from that of Schiller. Nevertheless he says,

Wir werden wohl in der Ansicht dieses Werkes nicht variiren,

and again,

Ihre Bemerkungen zu "Faust" waren mir sehr erfreulich. Sie treffen, wie es natürlich war, mit meinen Vorsätzen und Planen recht gut zusammen, nur dass ich . . . . die höchsten Forderungen mehr zu berühren als zu erfüllen denke.

---

written in Rome in 1788, and that therefore the crucial passage from l. 1635 to l. 1769, which does not yet appear in the *Fragment*, is "aus einem Gusse" with what follows from l. 1770 to the beginning of the *Schülerszene*.

Vol. VIII of the *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft*, which is reported to contain an article by Otto Pniower on "Der Teufelspakt im *Faust*," I have not been able to secure to date (January 4, 1921).

As a matter of fact it is interesting to note that during the first year of the period of productivity which sets in with this exchange of views Goethe repeatedly makes reference, in letters and diary, to skeleton outlines and other devices ("Schema," "Übersicht") for the organization of the work as a whole[1] until finally, presumably some time in the latter part of 1799 or early in 1800, he draws up the much discussed "Schema," "Ideales Streben nach Einwirken und Einfühlen in die ganze Natur," etc.[2] During this period from 1797 to 1801 and most probably during the twelve months from April, 1800, to April, 1801, Goethe finishes the *Prologue in Heaven*, closes up the "grosse Lücke," which includes the Pact Scene between Faust and Mephistopheles, and writes at least a first draft of the closing scenes of Faust's earthly career, in which the outcome of the wager was bound to be an element of prime consideration.[3] Hence, in a relatively short period of time and under a creative impulse that distinctly sets out from the conscious endeavor of bringing coherence and a certain unity of purpose into what already existed and what was now being planned, the three scenes that concern us here are composed.

This is a matter of considerable importance. For if, in the face of this state of things, we were to find puzzling obscurities or even flat contradictions between the wager in heaven, the pact on earth, and the final settlement of both at the time of Faust's death, or, worse yet, within the stipulations and details of any one of the three passages taken by itself, we cannot lay such defects to conflicting plans prevailing at widely separated periods of composition and a certain cavalier indifference in regard to making the necessary adjustments. On the contrary, we are charging Goethe, and that the Goethe of *Hermann und Dorothea* and *Die natürliche Tochter*, with the inability to think straight or to express himself clearly in

[1] Cf. H. G. Gräf: *Goethe über seine Dichtungen*, II, 2, Nos. 908, 918, and 942.

[2] Cf. Gräf, *loc. cit.*, No. 949.

[3] The fact that the final form of the third passage (ll. 11573 ff.) is apparently of very late origin will be discussed later (see below, p. 133). As the changes then made do not introduce, however, any disturbing elements, but render the poet's previous intention only clearer and the coherence with the other two passages only closer, all three can, for the purposes of this investigation, be considered synchronous to the extent indicated above. Cf. the conversation with Boisserée of August 3, 1815 (Gräf, No. 1162).

a deliberate effort to provide a central framework on which the rambling superstructure was to be assembled and completed.[1]

Nevertheless, the many and widely different interpretations which have been advanced, not only of the problem as a whole, but even of almost every conceivable detailed feature of it, are positively bewildering. Consolation, if any, in regard to the validity and usefulness of the vast amount of critical—and uncritical—effort expended can only be found in the fact that in the most substantial and comprehensive of recent commentaries there is a definite trend toward at least approximate agreement on the more important points and wider acceptance of the idea of essential consistency and unity.[2]

A. THE PROLOGUE IN HEAVEN

(Lines 312–43)

The principal questions which have been raised in regard to this passage are the following:

1. Does the Lord actually accept the wager which Mephistopheles offers?

2. If he does, does not his omniscience invalidate the entire situation?

[1] This statement applies, of course, only to the three passages here under discussion and the new plan underlying them. That there are incompatibilities between this plan and certain passages which originated under the older conception, cannot be denied, I believe. Minor disturbances are created by passages, as e.g., lines 2635–38, which clearly point to the older plan but also yield to a reasonable interpretation according to the new idea. The passages which however create the greatest difficulty are the immediate continuation of the Pact Scene, especially lines 1770–1815, and Mephistopheles' monologue preceding the scene with the Student (ll. 1851–67), both of which appeared in the *Fragment* at a time when the Pact Scene proper did not yet exist. Sarauw, according to his theory of Italian origin for the Pact Scene (see above, p. 113), is obliged to attempt a unitary interpretation of the entire text from 1635 to 1867, but while he makes observations on Mephistopheles' monologue which deserve careful consideration, he fails to clear away, or even to recognize, the apparent difficulties in lines 1770–1815, or more especially 1803–5 and 1810–15. Niejahr's careful, though to my mind hyper-analytic discussion of the Pact Scene in Vol. XX of the *Jahrbuch* is not referred to by Sarauw, either directly or indirectly.

[2] The sanest and on the whole most convincing opinions are those expressed by Erich Schmidt and Georg Witkowski in the introduction and notes of their respective annotated editions of *Faust* ("Jubiläums-Ausgabe" and Hesse und Becker), though neither of them treats the question connectedly or at length, and by Georg Müller in his interesting book, *Das Recht in Goethes Faust* (Berlin, 1912, 372 pages), which, despite its often discursive presentation of unrelated legal erudition, has many excellent qualities and certainly deserves a more generous reception by the regular guild of Faust critics than has been accorded it by Max Morris in *Jahresberichte* for 1912. With Minor (*Goethes Faust*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1901) I totally disagree in his interpretation of the wager between Faust and Mephistopheles, though his analysis of the scene in heaven is the best I know. Our American editions by Thomas and Goebel pay but little attention to the problem.

3. Which are the opposing contentions of the two contracting parties?

4. Is it Faust's eternal soul that is at stake or do lines 315–16 preclude any consequences beyond Faust's earthly life?

1. *Does the Lord actually accept the wager which Mephistopheles offers?*—There can be no doubt that Mephistopheles thinks so or pretends to think so.[1] On the other hand, it is equally apparent that the Lord says nothing which could be construed as the acceptance of a wager. He merely grants Mephistopheles freedom to play his rôle as tempter as best he can, while he declares with calm assurance that Faust cannot be led astray sufficiently to forget his better nature or higher aims. He predicts Mephistopheles' failure and final discomfiture, and is merely willing to let him try his luck. It is only by common consent that we can speak of a wager in Heaven between the Lord and Mephistopheles. As a matter of fact, the Lord with unperturbed reserve declines to descend to the plane of Mephistopheles' contentiousness.

Those critics are therefore far from the mark who accuse the Lord of violating the fundamental demands of divine love and justice by betting about the weal and woe of a human soul. In reality there is nothing of the kind. In fact, if we look more closely we find that Mephistopheles merely asks for that which is his traditional right, although a right which, as he is aware, the Lord may limit or perhaps even annul in any given case. For when the Lord says:

> Des Menschen Thätigkeit kann allzuleicht erschlaffen,
> Er liebt sich bald die unbedingte Ruh;
> Drum geb' ich gern ihm den Gesellen zu,
> Der reizt und wirkt und muss als Teufel schaffen [ll. 340–43],

he clearly does not refer to a new or special arrangement, but to an established practice. In the Lord's plan of salvation such a task has once for all been assigned to Mephistopheles, and if the latter (in ll. 313–14) seems to ask for specific permission, it is merely to make sure, in view of the bet he has offered, that the Lord has not perchance made different disposition in this case.

The Lord, thus, is far from submitting Faust's destiny to any unheard-of dangers, still less, of course, to a wanton game of chance;

[1] Cf. l. 331, even if l. 312 were taken merely as colloquial swagger.

as far from doing so as the imperturbably self-assured figure in the Book of Job. In *Faust*, the whole scene is in a less austere mood; it is richer in color and more human in tone, but neither in thought nor word does Goethe ascribe anything to the figure of the Lord that is at variance with a lofty conception or essentially reverential treatment.

2. *Does not the Lord's omniscience invalidate the entire situation?*— It has been urged repeatedly that inasmuch as the Lord knows the ultimate outcome with absolute certainty, it is neither fair for him to accept a wager, nor is there that modicum of uncertainty without which there can be no genuine dramatic suspense.

The foregoing discussion has practically furnished the answer to the former of the two objections. Moreover, the Lord's omniscience is certainly not supposed to be unknown to Mephistopheles, nor is the Lord making any concealment of what he foresees as the future result, nor trying to take advantage of Mephistopheles' blind eagerness. Aside from the humiliation of having to acknowledge his wrong (l. 327) the latter is not threatened by any further harm or danger in case he loses his wager. His efforts will have been in vain: that is all. There surely is no reason for us to worry about his being subjected to anything like unfair treatment.

The second question, whether the Lord's prophecy of the outcome, coupled with his omniscience, does not invalidate the idea of a struggle with a doubtful issue, would surely have to be answered in the affirmative if we were dealing with a philosophical treatise addressing itself to cold reason and not with a work of poetry making its primary appeal to the imagination and the emotions. The real question therefore is whether or no the poet's art succeeds in putting the reader under the transitory spell of its power of suggestion. At any rate, Goethe has carefully avoided reminding us, in the chants of the angels or in the introductory remarks of Mephistopheles, of the Lord's omniscience; Mephistopheles, we feel, has been successful in many a previous venture; and he shows himself to be not only undismayed, but confident of victory. So despite our reason, we may well tremble at the thought of his craftiness, of the promised non-interference of the Lord, and of human frailty.

3. *Which are the opposing contentions of the contracting parties?*— Only general expressions are used by both the Lord and Mephis-

topheles to denote what they expect Faust's conduct to be, although it is perfectly clear that what the one hopes to accomplish is the irreconcilable opposite of what the other is looking forward to. The Lord, who speaks of Faust as his servant, admits that his present service shows him still in a state of confusion, but predicts that clear vision and good fruits will appear in time, and even though like all men who "strive" Faust will continue to be subject to "error," he will not lose his moral autonomy, but like all truly "good" men, he will remain conscious of the right road even when groping in the dark. Thus Mephistopheles will not be able to draw him away from his original source in order to lead him downward along his path. This, whatever it may mean in detail, is clearly what Mephistopheles feels sure he can do. He is, however, far less explicit than the Lord and makes only one attempt to define his object, when he declares:

Staub soll er fressen, und mit Lust [l. 334].

Here "Staub" plainly implies the strongest possible contrast to "Urquell," things low, coarse, and deadening. On them Faust is to feed and he is to do it with pleasure.

What, however, is perfectly clear is that no occasional individual act is to decide, but that both the Lord and Mephistopheles are referring to the formation of character or habit, to a permanent state of soul from which conduct will flow of necessity. What the Lord has in mind is spoken of as "Streben"; it is to lead to "Klarheit," "Blüte," "Frucht," which perhaps without undue straining may be paraphrased as *das Wahre, Schöne, Gute.* To this Mephistopheles' program stands diametrically opposed.

4. *Is it the fate of Faust's soul after death that is at stake?*—Despite the fact that a natural reading of the scene as a whole clearly suggests an affirmative answer, a number of well-known critics have stoutly maintained the opposite. They base their opinion on two considerations: first, the contention that the Lord's fatherly love and sense of justice would prevent his making the eternal welfare of a human soul dependent on a wager; and, second, the ostensible restriction of Mephistopheles to Faust's life on earth, contained in the words of the Lord,

So lang er auf der Erde lebt,
So lange sei dir's nicht verboten [ll. 315–16],

and in Mephistopheles' rejoinder that he is interested in men only as long as they are alive.

The first of these two arguments, as has been shown above (see p. 117), is based on a misconception. Let us see whether the second carries more weight.

In the two lines just quoted all commentators, as far as I know, see a *limitation* of Mephistopheles' efforts to Faust's earthly life and overlook completely that there would really be no sense to such a stipulation. Where do we learn—in Bible, legend, or popular tradition—that the power of the devil to tempt and, if possible, seduce a man does not *eo ipso* end with his life on earth? God's decision on his ultimate fate—salvation or damnation—belongs to the hereafter, but the record on which that final decision will rest is closed with the end of man's existence on earth. Even where a purgatory is thought of, which is not the case in Goethe's drama, the spirits of evil have no longer any power to lead the soul into new error after death.[1] It is clear that the traditional explanation of the lines in question should be abandoned. Not a limitation is expressed, but on the contrary widest possible latitude. Line 315, which is generally read with the emphasis on "Erde," has its chief stress on "So lang." Mephistopheles has asked for permission to lead Faust along his road and by the use of "sacht" ("Ihn meine Strasse sacht zu führen"; l. 314) has indicated that even he realizes it will have to be done cautiously and will require time. If limited to a short period, he implies, it would not be a fair test. Hence the Lord, assuring him that he will have the fullest opportunity to try his skill, replies:

> Só lắng er auf der Erde lébt,
> Só lắnge sei dir's nicht verbóten [ll. 315–16].

Thus interpreted the two lines not only gain a logical and forceful connection with what precedes; they also appear far more organically linked with the famous line following:

> Es irrt der Mensch so lang er strebt [l. 317].

[1] Minor is clearly conscious of the superfluity, not to say meaninglessness, of such a limitation ("Mephistopheles findet die Bedingung ganz selbstverständlich und ganz allgemein, nicht bloss für Faust, giltig") but he too cannot rid himself of the idea that a limitation is expressed. Cf. *Goethes Faust*, 2, 91–93.

For if error is inevitable as long as there is striving, then Mephistopheles may claim to have a chance of seducing his victim as long as death has not yet put him automatically beyond the danger of further temptation.

Another group of critics go, however, still farther and construe the terrestrial limitation which they see in lines 315–16 as foreordaining the ultimate failure of Mephistopheles' efforts and Faust's rescue from his power after death.[1] This is an even greater misconception, not borne out by anything expressed or implied in the text itself. For even if the lines in question were to be interpreted as stipulating a limitation, this limitation would clearly refer to the efforts of temptation only, not to the subsequent result. If it is asserted that the *Prologue in Heaven* absolutely predicts Goethe's intention of saving his hero, the claim must rest on the predictions of the Lord in lines 309 ff. and 327 ff., interpreted in the light of his omniscience and Mephistopheles' subordinate relation, not however on lines 315–16.

But what, then, has been asked by some, is the meaning of Mephistopheles' statement that his interest in men expires with death,

> Da dank' ich euch; denn mit den Todten
> Hab' ich mich niemals gern befangen [ll. 318–19]?

Does this not prove that the Mephistopheles of the *Prologue*—whatever may have been Goethe's plans before or after—is merely a terrestrial teaser and tempter, a "Schalk," who does not even aim to reach out beyond man's life on earth, and that so much the more as the *Prologue* contains no direct reference to hell? As a matter of fact, the lines offer not the least difficulty to a natural interpretation. If Mephistopheles is a tempter and seducer of men on earth, he can play his rôle as such with the hope of success only as long as they are living. The dead, as we have seen, are beyond his reach. But it should hardly be necessary to point out that the case is entirely different where he has been successful or believes he is going to be. The very comparison which he makes between

[1] Some who do not go so far admit nevertheless, as e.g., Goebel in his edition of the First Part of *Faust* (New York, 1907, p. 262), "the implication of these lines that Mephistopheles is to have no claim on Faust in the life hereafter." As a matter of fact, not even such an implication exists.

himself in his relation to his victim and a cat playing with a mouse (cf. ll. 321–22) should be convincing enough. The cat may spurn a dead mouse, but it tries to catch a live one, not to let it run again, but to devour.

No other assumption tallies, moreover, with a natural and unforced interpretation of expressions like the following, some of which are used by Mephistopheles and others by the Lord,

> . . . . den sollt ihr noch verlieren [l. 312].
> Zieh diesen Geist von seinem Urquell ab [l. 324].
> . . . . führ' ihn. . . Auf deinem Wege mit herab [ll. 325–26].
> Triumph aus voller Brust [l. 333].
> Staub soll er fressen, und mit Lust [l. 334].

They certainly cannot refer to temporary error, for that the Lord has admitted from the start. They evidently refer to at least the hypothetic possibility of Faust becoming permanently ensnared in the meshes of Mephistopheles' net. And even if we are prepared to admit that no wager or pact *as such* will mechanically decide Faust's ultimate fate, but that the final decision will rest with the Lord, our sense of the Lord's unerring justice assures us that if such a result were to come to pass, he would admit himself defeated and declare for Mephistopheles and against Faust. If we had not this assurance there would be no meaning whatever in the poetic device of a wager, even though only a one-sided wager.

B. THE PACT BETWEEN FAUST AND MESPHISTOPHELES

(Lines 1635–1775)

In regard to this scene, the following problems have given rise to the most serious differences of opinion:

1. Are the pact offered by Mesphistopheles and the wager offered by Faust *both* binding?

2. If not, why are both Faust and Mephistopheles willing to change from the contractual agreement to the wager?

3. Which is the real wager offered and accepted?

4. Do its terms agree with those underlying the wager in heaven?

1. *Are the pact offered by Mephistopheles and the wager offered by Faust both binding?*—To start with, Mephistopheles offers himself to Faust as a companion and eventually servant [ll. 1646 ff.], and

only when Faust desires to know the conditions of such an association, he proposes the following terms:

> Ich will mich *hier* zu deinem Dienst verbinden,
> Auf deinen Wink nicht rasten und nicht ruhn;
> Wenn wir uns *drüben* wieder finden,
> So sollst du mir das Gleiche thun [ll. 1656–59].

That is, he suggests a fixed contractual agreement, based on the idea of service and wages, and practically identical with the pact in earlier Faust literature, except that instead of the usual twenty-four years Mephistopheles stipulates the length of Faust's natural life as time-limit for his services.[1] Aside from this point, there is nothing in the terms of this pact that corresponds with the stipulations in heaven. On the contrary, the emphasis which there has been laid on spiritual values as the decisive criteria, plainly suggests that a mechanical pact of this kind would find no recognition at the hands of the Lord. Here, for a moment, two entirely different world-views are in plain sight of each other, and any attempt at reconciliation of the two is bound to be forced. In passing, as it were, Goethe here merely pays his respects to one of the time-honored traditions of the theme, as he has done in numerous instances elsewhere.[2] Incidentally, it may be claimed, he scores a point by thus placing in strongest possible relief the new idea which underlies his own conception of the relation of Faust and Mephistopheles.

Faust, in the wild despair that has only just found torrential expression in the curse he has hurled against everything endearing life to man (ll. 1583–1606), is not averse to such a pact. His unbearable sorrows are of this life, and if in Mephistopheles' society somehow or other he can hope to drown these, he does not care what may or may not await him in a life to come.

> Das Drüben kann mich wenig kümmern;
> Schlägst du erst diese Welt zu Trümmern,
> Die andre mag darnach entstehn. . . . . [ll. 1660–70].

Everything now points to the immediate conclusion of the pact as proposed. Nevertheless this does not happen, and the conversation takes an unexpected turn. The passage which has just been

[1] Like most critics who discuss at all the meaning of "wenn" in l. 1658, I take it as temporal, not conditional. Cf., however, Lichtenberger, *Le Faust de Goethe*, 1911, p. 49.

[2] Cf. e.g., the signing of a document with Faust's blood.

quoted in part is clearly not construed by Mephistopheles as an acceptance, for after Faust has finished speaking, Mephistopheles is still urging him to accept:

> In diesem Sinne kanst du's wagen.
> Verbinde dich; . . . . [ll. 1671–72].

After these words, however, it is distinctly only the wager offered by Faust that both, with due formality, agree to. The pact is no longer mentioned. It has given way to, or better perhaps, it has been merged into a wager. I prefer to say it has been merged or transformed into a wager because the basic conditions of the pact —service on the part of Mephistopheles and Faust's soul as payment therefor—are taken over as the stakes into the wager offered by Faust.[1]

A further objection against the assumption, championed by Minor,[2] that the pact and the wager both stand, the latter as a sort of codicil to the former, lies in the fact that such an agreement would not be a wager. It would be far less of a wager than the one-sided one between the Lord and Mephistopheles. There Mephistopheles at any rate—and he alone is concerned—sees things in terms of a wager: "Both of us covet Faust's soul. If I can accomplish what I claim, I'll get it. If things turn out as you claim they will, you'll have it." But Faust's offer to Mephistopheles would simply run thus: "If you succeed in satisfying me through your gifts you can have my soul at once. If you fail—you'll get it a little later." A "wager" with anything like a balancing of advantage and disadvantage in the case of winning or losing requires the agreement to read as follows: "You offer your services, which you claim can make me forget the misery of life. I offer my soul after death. If you succeed, you win my soul; in fact you may then have it at once. Rather hell than a life as slave of your worthless and degrading pleasures. If I prevail, however, I'll remain free and you will have had your services for naught."

It is clear, then, the assumption of the validity of the pact creates difficulties and incongruities of all sorts. It contradicts the spirit and purpose of the whole *Prologue in Heaven* and connects up with absolutely nothing at the end of Faust's life. Goethe in his

[1] The "Dienst" mentioned in l. 1704 reverts to that of ll. 1656–57, and the "Fesseln" of l. 1701 correspond to ll. 1658–59.

[2] *Goethes Faust*, 2, 194–95.

later utterances on Faust's fate never so much as refers to it, but only speaks of the wager.[1] Nevertheless we should, of course, have to admit its existence and make the best of it, if a natural reading or a searching analysis of the text required it. But when exactly the opposite is the case and violence has to be done to the text to establish the pact as binding, common sense would suggest that we trouble no further about it.

2. *Why are both Faust and Mephistopheles willing to change from the pact to the wager?*—It is with admirable skill that Goethe in thirty-two short lines (1660–91), assigning only two speeches to each of the two characters, brings about the transition from the traditional contract to the fundamentally different wager. This success is so much the more noteworthy since in such a situation a change in the terms proposed by one party is likely to be objected to as disadvantageous by the other. Nevertheless the motivation for the behavior of both Faust and Mephistopheles is surprisingly natural and logical.

Either of them is entitled to believe that he is gaining a decided advantage by the change from the pact to wager; and if it must be admitted that Faust is in too reckless a mood to care for relative advantages or disadvantages and does not act consciously from such impulses, then it is the inherent soundness of his nature which instinctively makes him shape matters in accordance with the dictates of his being.

As for Faust, it is true, his ruin, which otherwise would be postponed to the end of his life, may come very soon. But if so, it will only shorten what is to him a well-nigh unbearable existence and, moreover, it must commend itself to his sense of right and fitness. In that case he knows he deserves no better. "Wie ich beharre bin ich Knecht, Ob dein, was frag' ich, oder wessen" (ll. 1710–11). On the other hand, it is his conviction—and on that his wager rests —that such a surrender of his true nature to the temptations of a Mephistopheles will never come.

Mephistopheles, on the other hand, no less considers the change to his advantage. Confident that he can accomplish what Faust

[1] In a conversation with Boisserée of August 3, 1815(Gräf, No. 1162), Goethe, in reply to Boisserée's statement that he expects the devil to be worsted in the end, makes the significant remark, "Faust macht im Anfang dem Teufel eine Bedingung, woraus Alles folgt." This "condition" can be only the wager offered in ll. 1692 ff.; and if "everything" develops from it, the pact as such is clearly ruled out.

declares he will never be able to do—just as cock-sure, as a matter of fact, as he had been in heaven in his conversation with the Lord—he believes that he will not have to bother himself in service to the end of Faust's life, but that his object will be attained much sooner. That it may not be attained at all is an alternative which his conceit prevents him from considering.

3. *Which is the real wager offered and accepted?*—This is the crucial question of the problem as a whole, and on its right understanding, more than on anything else, depends a really satisfactory answer to the ultimate question whether, at the close of the drama, Faust has fairly won or lost his wager.

An objective consideration of what is the real content of the wager which Faust offers and Mephistopheles accepts has been much interfered with by the prominence given both in the Pact Scene and in the Death Scene to those words which, when addressed to the fleeting moment, are to express delight in what it has brought and a wish that things might remain as they are. In the Pact Scene, Faust says to Mephistopheles:

> Werd' ich zum Augenblicke sagen:
> Verweile doch! du bist so schön!
> Dann magst du mich in Fesseln schlagen,
> Dann will ich gern zu Grunde gehn! . . . . [ll. 1699–1706].

At the very end of his life, in a most significant situation, these fateful words again come from his lips. To most critics it has seemed perfectly clear, therefore, that, technically or legally at any rate, Faust loses his wager and that through this very use of the phrase as a sort of "Leitmotiv" the poet has wished to emphasize what he himself considered the central content of the wager.

Let us examine the facts. Whoever emphasizes the grave consequences for Faust of the mere repetition of a stated phrase, without carefully inquiring, first of all, whether the real meaning and purpose of the words is the same in both instances, whatever else he may be, is a strict constructionist. Very well, then let him not overlook the fact that, *strictly construed*, the passage in question does not belong to the wager at all. The actual wager, beyond a peradventure of doubt, is stated in the six preceding lines,

> Werd' ich beruhigt je mich auf ein Faulbett legen,
> So sei es gleich um mich gethan!

Kannst du mich schmeichelnd je belügen
Dass ich mir selbst gefallen mag,
Kannst du mich mit Genuss betrügen;
Das sei für mich der letzte Tag! [ll. 1692–97].

For Faust's next words, "Die Wette biet' ich," refer clearly to these words and not to what follows. Mephistopheles does not wait with his acceptance for any further explanations or additions, but at once exclaims "Top!" and strikes his right hand into the outstretched right of Faust, who then with the words, "Und Schlag auf Schlag!" confirms the fact that the agreement is complete by letting his left hand fall on the two clasped hands.[1] The wager at this moment therefore is complete, offered and accepted in due form—and not one word has been said of "Verweile doch! du bist so schön!"—certainly an important fact, although to my knowledge nowhere definitely recognized.[2]

The application which I myself desire to make of the point which I have raised is not in the direction of excluding the second passage from the true content of the wager. My object is, first of all, to silence the so-called strict constructionists by a somewhat better application of their own principle. Aside from that, I am quite prepared to recognize the second passage as a weighty and significant element of the wager as a whole. Faust clearly feels it as such, offers it as such, Mephistopheles accepts it, and, in the end, we are not dealing with a case argued at the bar of law and in keeping with a technical code, but before the free consciences of thinking and feeling men, who will not be debarred from pressing to the heart of a question by undue regard for defects of formal transmission.

But this much should be clear: *If* the second passage is to be admitted as substantial evidence it cannot possibly be so admitted by itself, nor even as the point of chief importance, but only in intimate connection with the preceding passage, which, after all, enjoys the advantage of unquestioned legitimacy.

[1] Thus, most acceptably, though differently from the current interpretation, the act is described by Minor (*Goethes Faust*, 2, 194) and Georg Müller (*Das Recht in Goethes Faust*, 324).

[2] In Georg Müller (*Das Recht in Goethes Faust*, 325) I find an indirect recognition of the difficulty. He prescribes that the hands must remain clasped at least till line 1706, i.e., at least the outward symbol is to carry its binding effect over into the second passage.

As soon as this fact is established, the wager cannot possibly be interpreted, as is so often done, as though it turned on Faust's unconditional declaration that he would never say to the passing moment: "Verweile doch! du bist so schön!" and that therefore he is willing to declare himself defeated if ever, under any circumstances, prompted by no matter what emotions, he should voice a wish for things to remain as they are, for time to stand still.

I readily admit that Faust, who only a few moments before has uttered his reckless curse, feels that way, and that someone who really understood him and knew how to lead him on might easily have driven him to such an all-including wager. Mephistopheles, however, is not his man. On the contrary, if anything saves Faust from the danger of such an agreement it is Mephistopheles himself. Through his crude self-complacency he draws all of Faust's scorn and indignation upon himself and the things he has to offer. Faust, as it were, is willing to purchase unseen at a dangerously high price a parcel of goods that serve his immediate purpose although he is convinced of their intrinsic worthlessness; but when the salesman attempts to treat him as a fool by extolling virtues that do not exist, his connoisseur's pride is stung and his whole attitude toward the bargain changed. Twice Mephistopheles makes the clumsy attempt:

> . . . . du sollst, in diesen Tagen,
> Mit Freuden meine Künste sehn,
> Ich gebe dir was noch kein Mensch gesehn [ll. 1672–74],

and again:

> Doch, guter Freund, die Zeit kommt auch heran
> Wo wir was Guts in Ruhe schmausen mögen [ll. 1690–91],

and twice Faust voices his contemptuous conviction that in this sphere there can be for him no talk of joy and contentment; first with withering scorn (Was willst du armer Teufel geben . . . . ll. 1675–77), and afterwards in flaming indignation by offering the wager in place of the pact.

What he asserts in it is that *idleness* (Faulbett), *self-complacency* (Selbstgefallen), and *pleasure* (Genuss) will never be able to gain control of him so as to satisfy him. Should they do that, then he is willing to acknowledge his soul forfeited to Mephistopheles at once. The three terms clearly characterize the different aspects of

a typical case of sensual enslavement and moral degeneracy, with complete loss of all idealistic striving or "Streben," and it is only against these things, which to him sum up the promised joys of Mephistopheles, that Faust sets up his bold denial and wager. If, therefore, immediately after the handshaking has taken place, he continues: "Werd' ich zum Augenblicke sagen: Verweile doch! du bist so schön!" etc., two things seem clear. First, the "moment" he has in mind is not any moment whatsoever, no matter what its content might be, but a moment devoted to one or all of the Mephistophelean "good" things whose power over him he has just challenged; and second, that which prompts him to make the additional statement is a purely emotional impulse. He does not really want to say anything new, nor add anything to what he has said. It is solely a question of intensity. As he often does, he carries that which is clamoring in him for still extremer utterance to the last possible point of paradoxical hyperbole. If ever he can succumb to the allurements of Mephistopheles sufficiently to wish for the fleeting moment to delay, he will be doomed immediately. In the end it may be well that the words are spoken outside of the formal wager, for the language of defiant exaltation is rarely helpful in making contractual stipulations.[1]

4. *Do the terms of the wager on earth agree with those of the wager in heaven?*—I feel convinced that this is the case, and think it can best be shown by calling attention to what evidently is a logical or structural device underlying the chief formulas used both in heaven and earth. In offering his wager, Faust uses three phrases, each of which consists of two elements:

Faulbett—beruhigt
schmeichelnd belügen—selbst gefallen
Genuss—betrügen

[1] The wording of the written document which Faust signs we do not learn. This point has been strangely insisted upon by Victor Michels in *Euphorion* 13 (1906), 637 ff. in arguments which I am not able to follow. Space forbids my entering here upon a detailed discussion of this question, which is also treated at some length by Georg Müller in *Das Recht in Goethes Faust*, p. 331 f. Of course, Mephistopheles might have tried to get the better of Faust by writing into the bond (unless we assume that Faust not only signs it but himself writes it) both the pact and the wager, or for that matter other deviations from the actual agreement. But if so, the poet would have had to take us into his confidence. His very silence is plain proof that at least for substance of doctrine the written agreement must be assumed to be identical with the verbal one of which we have been witnesses.

In each instance there is expressed on the one hand an element of sensual or emotional temptation, and on the other a spiritual condition, a state of soul which is to be engendered thereby, and it is perfectly clear that Faust lays the chief emphasis on the latter.

Mephistopheles does not frame any counter-proposition. He merely accepts the wager. But he has previously attempted some formulas of his, which show an interesting parallelism with those used by Faust:

meine Künste sehn—mit Freuden
was Guts schmausen—in Ruhe.

Hence, he too is not satisfied with Faust's willingness to accept what he has to offer, but he too aims at a result which is thereby to be achieved. And if we go a step farther and examine the one programmatic formula which in heaven he used in speaking to the Lord,

Staub soll er fressen—und mit Lust

we find that it tallies exactly with the terms he uses toward Faust and those used by Faust himself.[1] They all denote the same twofold idea of indulgence in self-gratification and resultant contentment. What varies is merely the moods in which the different statements are made.

Everything is in perfect agreement, and I have no hesitation, with Erich Schmidt, to speak of "Beide identische Wetten."[2]

C. THE DEATH SCENE

(Lines 11573–95)

The following problems will be taken up seriatim, although everything hinges here on the one question: Who has won the wager?

1. Does Faust die a natural death, or is his death due to the fact that he speaks the fatal words, "Verweile doch, du bist so schön!"?

2. Does Faust win or lose his wager with Mephistopheles?

3. If he does not lose it through what transpires here at the end of his life, has he not previously lost it during the progress of the drama?

[1] Interesting, and perhaps not accidental, is the similarity in form and content of these formulas with that of the evangelist, "Liebe Seele, ... habe nun Ruhe, iss, trink und habe guten Mut," in Luke 2, 19–20.

[2] Jubiläums-Ausgabe, Vol. XIII, Einleitung, p. xxxii.

4. Is the issue on earth of such a nature that it settles automatically and unequivocally Mephistopheles' wager with the Lord?

1. *Does Faust die a natural death or not?*—This question acquires significance only on the assumption that Faust's life was to be forfeited whenever he should express a desire for time to stand still. In the last analysis, it turns therefore on the validity of the second half of the wager, independently of the first. As it has been shown that such an interpretation is untenable, we should have to decide whether, at the time of his death, when Faust speaks the words in question, he applies them to a moment of either idleness, or Mephistophelian enjoyment, or sterile self-complacency. Not even those, however, who maintain that Faust loses, set up such a preposterous claim, and it is clear therefore that Faust's death is not due to the words he has uttered.

On the contrary, Faust dies a natural death. The point can be proved not only by lines 11591–92,

> Der mir so kräftig widerstand,
> Die Zeit wird Herr, der Greis hier liegt im Sand,

but perhaps even more definitely by the earlier references to Faust's approaching death, on the part of the three comrades of "Sorge" in lines 11396–97 and of Mephistopheles himself in lines 11525 ff. and especially 11557–58.

If the scene in question belonged to the world of matter-of-fact reality we should have to say it is an accident that Faust's natural death at the age of one hundred years coincides with his utterance of the fatal words. If we consider, however, the requirements of dramatic effectiveness and, still more, of an evidently typical or symbolic treatment, the adopted device appears almost inevitable. Had Faust's final admission of the possibility of true human happiness been wrung from him at an earlier period of his life, his conflict with Mephistopheles would have been at an end. The drama, as the story of this conflict, would have had to end then and there if the poet expected us to accept his hero's confession as his final view of life, as "wisdom's last word." On the other hand, the Lord had given Mephistopheles leave to try his arts of seduction on Faust to the very end of his life on earth. Had Faust been destined to lose his struggle the catastrophe might easily have come at any time

in his career; but as he was to win, i.e., not to lose,[1] it had to be made clear that his resistance to the blandishments of Mephistopheles would continue to the end of life, and if this life was to be in any way symbolic of the general trials and triumphs of "eines Menschen hohes Streben" we had to be permitted to witness its power of resistance even to the limits of extremest old age.

2. *Does Faust win or lose his wager with Mephistopheles?*—Generally speaking, the more recent *Faust* literature shows a growing consensus of opinion that Faust wins his wager.[2] Cases of arch-negation, if they still occur, are few and far between. Numerous, to be sure, is as yet that group—and it includes some important names—which distinguishes between a verdict according to the letter (Wortlaut) and one according to the spirit (Sinn), the former favorable to Mephistopheles, the latter to Faust, but it is clear that in the last analysis this group is on the side of those declaring in favor of Faust, for, on both human and poetic grounds, not the letter, but the spirit is bound to prevail in this conflict.

Critics who are willing to give an unconditional verdict in Faust's favor base it generally not so much on a correct interpretation of the wager as on the fact that in the final text, as we now read it, Faust does not actually address the words in question to the fleeting moment. He speaks only conditionally, hypothetically (Zum Augenblicke dürft' ich sagen; l. 11581). Others lay stress on the fact that the moment which Faust has in mind is not a situation that he is then enjoying (except in anticipation) but that he is thinking of the future when his lofty vision might be realized. Hence, instead of bidding the passing present to linger (which clearly is the sense of l. 1699) he merely feels he might be justified in doing so sometime in a still distant future.

Evidently Goethe has done well to revise, as it would seem, the original version of Faust's testamentary speech quite shortly before his death, prompted by the desire for a more careful elaboration "der Hauptmotive, die ich, um fertig zu werden, allzu lakonisch

[1] It must be remembered that Faust does not wager that something *will* happen, but that something will *never* happen.

[2] The attempt to secure the assistance of a strictly legal interpretation proved a complete failure. The two learned jurists who in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, 24 (1903), 113–31, argued the case came to diametrically opposite findings.

behandelt hatte" (*Tgb.*, Jan. 24, 1832; Gräf, No. 1977). For if even in the face of this final redaction Goethe's critics have had such difficulties in deciding the wager, what would they have done with the earlier version which, instead of the entire sustained and noble speech of twenty-eight lines (ll. 11559–86) as we now read it, contained only a short passage of largely prosaic lines?

Dem Graben, der durch Sümpfe schleicht,
Und endlich doch das Meer erreicht,
Gewinn' ich Platz für viele Millionen,
Da will ich unter ihnen wohnen,
Auf wahrhaft eignem Grund und Boden stehn.
Ich darf zum Augenblicke sagen:
Verweile doch, Du bist so schön!
Es kann die Spur von meinen Erdetagen
Nicht in Äonen untergehn.[1]

Here it is clear that Faust speaks in the present tense to the present moment,[2] even though here, too, the present is dear to him not for its own sake, but because it reveals the possibility of a still better and broader future. And yet, as early as August 3, 1815, when Sulpiz Boisserée said to Goethe in regard to the final fate of Faust, then a matter of considerable debate, "Ich denke mir, der Teufel behalte Unrecht," Goethe with evident assent replied, "Faust macht im Anfang dem Teufel eine Bedingung, woraus Alles folgt."[3] This "Bedingung" is evidently not the one in line 1699 (Werd' ich zum Augenblicke sagen . . . .), for that, taken by itself, is literally fulfilled according to the text of the older version. It might explain Faust's losing, but not his winning the wager. Goethe here refers with satisfactory definiteness to lines 1692–97 as

[1] Cf. Otto Harnack's edition of *Faust* in Vol. V of *Goethes Werke*, ed. Karl Heinemann, Lpzg. and Wien, Bibliogr. Institut, n.d., pp. 21, 518, 572. This important change, strange to say, is mentioned by but few of the commentators, although many of them refer to the change from "darf" to "dürft'" in l. 11581. From the variants in the Weimar edition it is almost impossible to get a clear view of the condition of the MS at this point.

[2] The point is really of some importance; for critics who rest their claim that Faust wins his wager chiefly on the fact that he speaks only hypothetically and not of the present lose the entire basis for their contention as soon as the earlier reading is substituted for the final one. That is, according to their interpretation Goethe had Faust lose his wager until a few weeks before his death and then suddenly decided to make him win it—an apparent absurdity.

[3] Cf. above, p. 125, footnote 1. It is in this same conversation that Goethe, while refusing to give information about the end of Faust's career, states: "Aber es ist auch schon fertig, und sehr gut und grandios gerathen, aus der besten Zeit." (Gräf, No. 1162.)

the basic condition on which the wager between Faust and Mephistopheles turns, for on this supposition only does Faust remain victorious no matter whether we adopt the older and briefer text or the nobler and more explicit lines of the revised version.

Of course, if even the earlier reading justifies the assumption of Faust's victory over Mephistopheles, the later one positively clamors for it. When, in the shadow of death, Faust uses the ominous phrase that seems to challenge the fleeting moment to delay[1] and speaks of what he then experiences as the enjoyment of the best and highest which life had to offer him, he is referring to things that are as far removed from Mephistopheles' "Staub" or his own "Faulbett" as they are near the heart of what the Lord laid stress upon as "Tätigkeit" and "Streben."

Mephistopheles, who clings to inapplicable words and attempts to prove his claim by them, does no more nor less than what under similar circumstances a human extortioner would also do. He tries to make the best of what he instinctively feels to be a bad case bound to go against him.

The fact that Faust has won the wager over Mephistopheles (and the latter therefore, as we shall see, has lost his wager with the Lord) must not be construed to mean that thereby, *eo ipso*, to speak in the language of the religious symbolism in which the last scenes of the drama are conceived, he can claim entrance into heaven as one of the blessed. Only divine judgment can determine this, and if—as the advent of the angels proves—it decides in Faust's favor, despite the heavy guilt that rests on him, it represents a justice tempered by mercy and love.[2]

3. *Has Faust not lost the wager with Mephistopheles at some earlier point in the action?*—In answer to this question, which has repeatedly

[1] I am not able to discuss here the question what Goethe's reason may have been for reintroducing in the Death Scene the very phraseology used by Faust in the Pact Scene (not only in ll. 11581–82, but also in ll. 11593–95). I merely wish to refer to at least two places where explanations are attempted that are not based on a wrong conception of the wager: Otto Pniower in the Pantheon edition of *Faust*, Vol. II, Berlin, n.d. (1903), p. xlii and Otto Woerner, *Fausts Ende*, Freiburg i. Br., 1902, p. 25.

[2] From this point of view must be interpreted the often quoted letter of Goethe to K. E. Schubarth of November 3, 1820 (Gräf, No. 1219) in which Goethe says: "Mephistopheles darf seine Wette nur halb gewinnen, und wenn die halbe Schuld auf Faust ruhen bleibt, so tritt das Begnadigungsrecht des alten Herrn sogleich herein, zum heitersten Schluss des Ganzen."

been raised—and not without justification—it might of course suffice to point out that Mephistopheles does not think so. But inasmuch as Mephistopheles, especially in long stretches of the Second Part, almost completely loses the rôle of an aggressive adversary, this fact alone is not sufficiently convincing.

Here, too, everything necessarily depends upon our conception of the terms of the wager. If the mere desire for the fleeting moment to linger were to decide the wager against Faust, I think we should have to admit that he has lost it more than once, unless it be considered imperative that the very words, "Verweile doch, du bist so schön!" be spoken. These words, to be sure, Faust does not speak; but has he not felt them during moments of peaceful contemplation in "Wald und Höhle," in the enjoyment of Gretchen's love, or in even larger measure during his union with Helen?

Critics who raise these questions at all, generally answer them either by denying any wish on the part of Faust to delay the passing moment,[1] or by pointing to the disturbing factor of a guilty conscience and evil foreboding, or to the unreality of his dream-like experiences in the sphere of Helen. Simpler and more convincing is again an explanation that rests upon a proper interpretation of the wager. For in all such moments of happiness, the Gretchen episode included, it can be shown that Faust is far removed from that sphere of sensual and spiritual degradation which underlies the terms of his wager with Mephistopheles. Even if he actually had addressed to the fleeting moment the prayer to delay, Mephistopheles would have had no better right for claiming to have won the wager than he has in the end at the hour of Faust's death.

4. *Does the issue on earth automatically settle Mephistopheles' wager with the Lord?*—That Mephistopheles loses his wager with the Lord is quite generally admitted, even by those who doubt or deny his failure in his relation with Faust. Goethe himself, from whom we are unable to quote any absolutely unequivocal statement in regard to the outcome of the wager between Faust and Mephistopheles, expresses himself in this respect in the tersest and most definite language. Speaking to Eckermann in 1827, he declares,

[1] Certainly not an easy undertaking in the face of lines like 3191–92; 3217; 6493–94; 9381–82.

"dass der Teufel die Wette verliert," and the context makes it perfectly clear that the wager to which he has reference is the one in the *Prologue in Heaven.*[1]

Indeed, if it has been made clear (cf. above, p. 130) that the basic terms of Faust's wager with Mephistopheles are identical with those underlying Mephistopheles' wager against the Lord, then it needs no further proof that Faust's winning his wager against Mephistopheles necessarily means that Mephistopheles has lost his wager with the Lord.

The foregoing analysis of the entire problem, in the light of the different interpretations attempted and objections raised, seems to me to furnish convincing evidence that, whatever may be our judgment about the lack of regular symmetry and close-knit unity in the work as a whole or about undeniable incongruities or dislocations in certain scenes, the central axis, around which the dramatic action of Goethe's Faust moves, is sound and without flaw.

As Julian Schmidt has once expressed it, the three characteristic passages which at present carry the central thought of the drama were still lacking in the original versions of the *Urfaust* and the *Fragment.* They are not the trunk from which all this motley variety of scenes has sprouted, but rather the support that has been placed under it afterwards. But I feel inclined to continue: it is a support carefully planned and strongly put together, quite capable of holding up the great mass of the luxuriant growth resting upon it, even though here and there single unruly shoots may be trailing to the ground or threatening to fly off with the breeze—not to the disadvantage of the living beauty of the whole, even though to the annoyance of some of the sternest among the high priests of unruffled regularity and order.

A. R. HOHLFELD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

[1] Cf. Gräf, No. 1481.

THE CAVE SCENE IN *DIE FAMILIE SCHROFFENSTEIN*

At the beginning of the famous cave scene of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* (Act V, scene 1) stands a stage-direction which runs in part as follows: "(Agnes mit einem Hute, *in zwei Kleidern. Das Überkleid ist vorn mit Schleifen zugebunden.*)"

This is somewhat unusual, as it gives the impression that Agnes must have changed her usual mode of dressing to be ready for extraordinary events soon to be enacted in the cave. Certainly Kleist felt, when he wrote the direction, that the actress needed special instructions in costuming for the part.

Scholars have accepted this stage-direction at par without much question. Even Meyer-Benfey, who analyzes the play with his usual detail and pedantic fulness, seems not to suspect anything unusual here. But a comparison of the direction with the text of the scene will show that it does not accord with Kleist's original conception, that it is an afterthought, a questionable attempt to make the play acceptable to the theater-going public.

Dressing "in zwei Kleidern" is not motivated in any way in the play. An attempt at motivation would be an intolerable absurdity. Putting on a double suit in the safety of her castle at Warwand, in order to run into danger in the mountain-cave and exchange the outer one for Ottokar's mantle, in an effort to deceive two murderers from Rossitz, Rupert, and Santing, merely to save her life, would be the acme of absurdity.

Plainly Agnes suspects no danger until she has come to the cave and Barnabe has confided to her the accidental meeting with Rupert and Santing (Act IV, scene 4) and her indiscretion in mentioning her errand to Agnes and the tryst in the mountains, for she expresses the vain wish:

> Hättest du mir früher das gesagt! Ich fühle
> Mich sehr beängstigt, möchte lieber, dass
> Ich nicht gefolgt dir wäre.

Just as plainly, Ottokar is coming to save Agnes' life from his father's hands, but he has no plan formed, no conception of an

exchange of clothing as the means of rescue. This must appear from the following circumstances. He has just learned of Sylvester's innocence, has sent Barnabe to bring Agnes to the mountain-cave, that he may announce his discovery. Before going himself he confides the news to his mother, Eustache, who, misjudging Rupert's mood, reveals to the latter not only the innocence of Sylvester but also the love of Ottokar and Agnes and their habitual trysting in the mountains (Act IV, scene 1). This leads at once to Ottokar's imprisonment, so that Rupert may seek out Agnes unhindered. By the connivance of the turnkey, Eustache gains admission to the prison, confesses to Ottokar her great indiscretion and Rupert's murderous plan:

> Und jetzt erschlägt er seine Tochter [Act IV, scene 5].

Also:

> . . . . Wenn sie in dem Gebirge jetzt,
> Ist sie verloren, er und Santing sucht sie.

These two bits of information from the mother, coupled with his own knowledge of Agnes' presence in the mountains, condition his whole behavior. He is already considerably delayed by his imprisonment, but he knows the directest path to the cave, and may yet arrive in time. He makes in perfect safety the rather remarkable leap of fifty feet (cf. Wallenstein's safe fall in Regensburg) from a rather remarkably unguarded window, succeeds in evading his father and Santing, and arrives at *nightfall*.

The time guarantees deep darkness at a little distance within from the mouth of the cave, and everything is in keeping. Barnabe has to look "scharf hin auf den Weg" and "es wird sehr finster schon im Tal"; she sees "aus allen Häusern schon Lichter schimmern" and "da regt sich etwas Dunkles doch im Nebel," and she can barely distinguish human shapes at a little distance, but not whether they are one or two. In such a scene there is no need for *double* costumes to avoid *nudity*.

When the lovers meet, Ottokar impulsively reveals his fear for Agnes' safety by his joy in finding her *still alive*. From Agnes he now learns what he had not known before his arrival, namely, that Rupert and Santing are not *blindly* seeking her in the mountains, but have a clue in the movements of Barnabe ("Wir müssen ihnen

auf die Fährte gehen," Act IV, scene 4). This revelation makes a plan of rescue imperative, and imposes haste. But little time is left. The *exchange of clothing* occurs to Ottokar now for the first time as promising a disguise under which Agnes may escape to Warwand in safety, one which he himself can easily doff in the presence of Rupert, if necessary, or in which he may fall unrecognized, if only Agnes is saved.

How does Kleist, how does Ottokar conceive this change of clothing?

Plainly as something *unmaidenly*, something that Agnes in her modesty would refuse as readily and positively as Käthchen von Heilbronn refuses to bare her feet and ankles in the presence of Gottschalk when she wishes to cross the river with the "Futteral" (*Käthchen*, Act IV, scene 1). Agnes' fear of the murderers and her modesty must both be overcome. Ottokar accomplishes both by laying before her his discovery of Peter's death by drowning, Sylvester's consequent innocence, and the hopes for their union to be grounded on these facts.

> . . . . Lasst uns
> Die schöne Stunde innig fassen. Möge
> Die Trauer schwatzen und die Langeweile,
> Das Glück ist stumm. Wir machen diese Nacht
> Zu einem Fest der Liebe, willst du?

He promises reconciliation of the fathers, public betrothal, and then:

> Mit diesem Kuss verlob' ich mich dir.

And now he announces the plan of rescue:

> Noch eins. Wir werden hier *die Kleider wechseln*,
> In einer Viertelstunde führst du Agnes
> In *Männerkleidern* heim.

This passage must be forced from its natural meaning, if it is applied to a simple exchange of Agnes' "Überkleid" and "Hut" for Ottokar's "Mantel" and "Helm." But that the exchange is something more complete is shown by the careful removal of Barnabe to the cave's mouth, as well as by Ottokar's succeeding efforts to take Agnes' heart and imagination by storm with the words:

> Du wirst mein Weib, mein Weib! Weisst du denn auch,
> Wie gross das Mass von Glück?

and the less delicate hint:

O du Glückliche! Der Tag,
Die Nacht vielmehr ist nicht mehr fern. Es kommt, du weisst,
Den Liebenden das Licht nur in der Nacht,—
Errötest du?

Agnes' embarrassed question:

So wenig schützt das Dunkel?

and Ottokar's reply:

Nur vor dem Auge, Törin, doch ich seh'
Mit meiner Wange, dass du glühst,

confirm the impression of deep darkness.

Then follows the description of the wedding-day, the departure of the guests, the retirement of the wedded lovers, all accompanied by appropriate action. Agnes' love is enkindled, her imagination filled, so that she yields passively to what follows, scarcely realizing it, *save as a thing permissible to wedded lovers.*

Dann kühner wird die Liebe,
Und weil du mein bist—bist du denn nicht mein?—
So nehm' ich dir den Hut vom Haupte (*er tut es*), störe
Der Locken steife Ordnung (*er tut es*), drücke kühn
Das Tuch hinweg (*er tut es*), du lispelst leis', o lösche
Das Licht! und plötzlich, tief verhüllend, webt
Die Nacht den Schleier um die heilige Liebe,
Wie jetzt.

At this stage Agnes' imagination identifies the dark cave with the bridal chamber after the candle has been extinguished to spare the bride's modesty. She has already had removed her hat and the kerchief that hid her neck and bosom (cf. Graf Wetter's "Tuch" which he gives to Käthchen to cover her exposed bosom, and the "Halstuch" which Freiberg threatens to take from Kunigunde to reveal her deformity, *Käthchen*, Act II, scene 6), and now, while passion floods like a bank-full stream in spring

. . . . schnell
Löse ich die Schleife, schnell noch eine (*er tut es*), streife dann
Die fremde Hülle leicht dir ab (*er tut es*).

Again it is forcing the natural meaning to make "fremde Hülle" mean a mere outer garment. That which does not belong to the body, is not a part of the body, is "fremd." We have here a contrast

between the natural body and the body's foreign covering, and the language can only imply a complete removal of Agnes' clothing.

This is confirmed by her behavior. As she feels her garments removed, she exclaims: "O Ottokar, was machst du?" and in her tense emotion falls upon his neck to hide her confusion, and he answers:

> . . . . *Ein Gehilfe der Natur*
> *Stell' ich sie wieder her,*

words which are absolutely devoid of sense, if Agnes is not absolutely nude. How could he, as a servant of nature, *restore nature*, by removing an "Überkleid" only, and leaving her *completely dressed?* It does not help at all that the author inserts here another stage-direction: "(An dem Überkleide beschäftigt)." It only makes the following passage stand out more sharply in contrast, when Ottokar justifies his act by the question:

> . . . . Denn wozu noch
> Das Unergründliche geheimnisvoll
> *Verschleiern?* Alles Schöne, liebe Agnes,
> *Braucht keinen anderen Schleier als den eignen,*
> Denn der ist freilich selbst die Schönheit.

A moment of anxiety interrupts them here, for Rupert and Santing are approaching the cave's mouth and have probably caught sight of Barnabe, the lovers' sentinel. Haste is needed. Ottokar returns to Agnes and says:

> . . . . *du frierst,*
> Nimm diesen Mantel um (*er hängt ihr seinen Mantel um*).

Again this implies her nudity, and shows what sort of re-dressing is undertaken. It is not a formal and complete donning of Ottokar's suit, for he has not undressed. She has but a man's mantle folded close about her. As she sits thus before him, Ottokar exclaims:

> Wer würde glauben, dass der *grobe Mantel*
> So *zartes* deckte, als ein *Mädchenleib?*
> Drück' ich dir noch *den Helm auf deine Locken,*
> Mach' ich auch Weiber mir zu Nebenbuhlern.

The contrast here of "der grobe Mantel" and "ein zartes Mädchenleib" is in keeping with our interpretation and offers nothing in support of the stage-direction.

At this point a stage-direction tells us: "(Ottokar wirft schnell Agnes' Oberkleid über, und setzt ihren Hut auf)." Inasmuch as he has only removed his mantle and helmet, this is intelligible and sufficient. Now that the disguise is accomplished, Ottokar ventures to inform Agnes that his father is coming, and that no one will harm her, if she will only go boldly out of the cave "ohne ein Wort zu reden . . . . in deiner Männertracht."

It only remains to examine the closing scenes, to determine whether any other passage confirms or contradicts the assumption that Agnes leaves the cave *nude*, except for Ottokar's "Mantel" and "Helm."

We see later simply that the disguise is complete enough to fulfil its purpose. Agnes is permitted to pass by Santing and Rupert, because they believe her Ottokar, and when she returns to the cave, and Sylvester appears with torches, it deceives even her father, and she falls a victim to his mistaken revenge.

Still later, when blind Sylvius discovers the error by the sense of touch, the language is so general that it is not pertinent, and even the words of the grief-stricken parents of the dead lovers give no further support to either view.

Internal evidence proves that the original conception of Kleist was, that Agnes had all her clothing removed and escaped with Ottokar's mantle and helmet only. The insertion of the stage-directions was an afterthought, an effort to make the scene *theaterfähig*. Perhaps it was not alone the grotesque madness of Johann, and the impossible absurdity of the little finger of Peter's corpse being identified by the mother after it had been cooked for Barnabe's witches'-broth, that provoked the laughter of Kleist's friends in Switzerland when he read them these closing scenes. They may have been startled at the naïveté of a dramatist who demanded of his star actress a complete disrobing on the stage, even in theatrical darkness. For the Kleist who delighted in the "Schrecken in Bade" and evidently lingered with delight over the physical perfections of Käthchen, especially in the grotto scene, nothing could be more natural. If we add that he was at the height of his Rousseauistic cult at the time of his first Paris visit and his subsequent Swiss sojourn, the argument seems complete.

The result of the whole study would indicate further, that the cave scene may have been conceived first as a separate poem, a companion to the "Schrecken im Bade," and only later made the starting-point for the creation of a five-act drama. This backward development of the dramatic movement may readily account for the triviality and inconsequence of some elements of the exposition which have been stumbling-blocks to the careful reader. The action did not grow out of given materials by logical necessity, but it was pieced together to lead up to a scene already composed, which, however, still retained certain inextinguishable elements of its original conception that were discordant with the later dramatic inventions.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

FRIEDRICH LIENHARDS LITERATURBETRACHTUNG[1]

Unser Gegenstand *Friedrich Lienhards Literaturbetrachtung* schliesst eine gründliche Behandlung des Dichters Friedrich Lienhard aus, obwohl sie nötig wäre, denn von dem echtdeutschen Dichter aus dem Elsass ist hierzulande so gut wie nichts bekannt, und nicht einmal unter den Lehrern des Deutschen, die ihn aber ebenso kennen und bekannt machen sollten, wie es die Lehrer und Freunde des Französischen mit René Bazin tun. Und wie Bazins Roman aus dem Elsass *Les Oberlé* überall in den Vereinigten Staaten gelesen und gepriesen wird, so sollte auch Lienhards Roman aus der Revolutionszeit im Elsass *Oberlin* gelesen und gewürdigt werden. Es heisst im Vorwort zur 15. Auflage dieses Romans: "Der Verfasser ist Elsässer; da sein Geburtstag vor 1870 fällt, ist er sogar 'geborener Franzose,' obschon unsere unterelsässische Ecke, die ehemalige Grafschaft Hanau-Lichtenberg von französischer Zivilisation nur wenig Verwandlungen erfahren hat. Demnach kennt er Land und Leute aus eigener Anschauung und Blutsverwandtschaft. Er will gegen keine der beiden Nationen unbillig sein und keine Konfession verletzen. Seine Welt- und Kunstanschauung jedoch wurzelt im deutschen Geistes- und Gemütsleben."

Lienhard wurde 1865 in Rothbach im Unterelsass als Sohn eines Dorfschulmeisters geboren und studierte von 1884 an in Strassburg und Berlin; er brach aber sein Studium nach sieben Semestern ab, weil es ihn zum Schriftsteller drängte. Seine Universitätsstudien beendete er nicht, aber die neue Berliner revolutionäre Literatur der 1880er Jahre befriedigte ihn auf die Dauer auch nicht. In einen bürgerlichen Beruf fand er sich nicht, so entwickelte er sich frei zu seinem eigentlichen Beruf in der deutschen Literatur. Er war einige Jahre Hauslehrer, ging auf Reisen, war kurze Zeit in Berlin Zeitungsschreiber und ging wieder in die weite Welt, u.a. nach der Schweiz, Italien, Spanien, Skandinavien und Schottland. 1903 brach er mit der Tagesschriftstellerei. Seitdem ist er nicht

[1] Dieser Aufsatz gibt im wesentlichen den Vortrag wieder, wie er am 29. Dezember 1916 vor der Modern Language Association of America in Princeton University gehalten wurde.

mehr der Journalist Fritz Lienhard, wie er sich zuerst nannte, sondern Friedrich Lienhard, der freie Kritiker und freischaffende Dichter.

Als ein Dörfler ist er in die deutsche Literatur gekommen, und ein weltferner Dörfler ist er bis heute geblieben. Wie er in dem Gedicht auf Burns sagt:

Ich bin ja auch
Wie du zu Haus in Flur und Strauch.
Ich will in Not und Sonnenschein
Wie du ein Kind und Bauer sein!

1895, als ein Dreissigjähriger, beginnt Friedrich Lienhard sein eigentliches Dichtertum: es erscheinen seine *Lieder eines Elsässers*. Sie zeigen, warum es ihn in Berlin nicht lange gelitten hat. Politische Gründe sind es natürlich nicht, denn er achtete, ja liebte das Preussentum mit seiner Lebensordnung, seiner Gewissenhaftigkeit, seiner Zuverlässigkeit, mit seinem Sinn für Geschichte, und verehrte auch im Bunde mit andern deutschen Geistern den Preussen Friedrich den Grossen. Der Dörfler vom Unterelsass hasste die Grossstadt Berlin. Kennzeichnend heisst eins seiner Gedichte *Nie wie die Grossstadt!* Er fühlte sich als Elsässer. In einer Kriegsschrift vom Jahre 1914, betitelt: *Das deutsche Elsass*, schreibt er: "Wir [d.i. Elsässer] haben alle, neben der ruhigen Gastfreundschaft unseres schönen Landes, einen Wanderdrang und eine kriegerische Ader in unserm Wesen." Das zeigt sich hier wie in verschiedenen späteren Werken als eine deutsch gefärbte Aufnahmefähigkeit für alles Fremde, in Liedern und Büchern der Wanderlust und in der Vorliebe für das Heroische in der Kunst.

Ein Jahr nach den *Liedern eines Elsässers* erscheinen die stillschönen *Wasgaufahrten*, ein Wander- und Weltanschauungsbuch, in dem auch zu der Zeit Stellung genommen wird. 1897 folgte ein elsässisches Drama: *Gottfried von Strassburg*, 1898 eine Legende in drei Aufzügen von *Odilia*, der Schutzheiligen vom Elsass, mit dem liebevollen Wunsch im Schlusswort:

Ein Sonntag komme, dem kein Sonntag gleich,
All meinem Elsass, meinem Königreich!

Doch wie gern und wie schön unser Dichter auch sang und sagte von seinem Elsass, schliesslich konnte ihm ein Elsässer Poeten-

winkel nicht genügen. Das hat er in seinem Gedicht *Abschied vom Elsass* sehr tief ausgedrückt. Um 1900 bahnt er sich einen Weg wieder nach Deutschland, nach dem Deutschland seiner Ideale. Er fand auf diesem seinem Wege Hindernisse, die er wegräumen musste. Daher sehen wir ihn als Kritiker, der nunmehr zu gewissen Zeiterscheinungen in der Literatur seine bestimmte Stellung nimmt. Von jetzt an bleibt er sich seiner selbst als Dichterpersönlichkeit bewusst.

Seit 1900 haben wir zunächst eine Reihe kulturkritischer und ästhetischer Schriften und sodann eine Anzahl wenn vielleicht nicht immer grosser, so doch höchst bedeutsamer Zeugnisse seines künstlerischen Könnens.

Seine Kritik—von eigentümlich aufbauender Art—ist enthalten in Werken wie *Neue Ideale*, einer Sammlung von Aufsätzen, zuerst 1901 gedruckt, und *Die Wege nach Weimar* (1905–8). Eins seiner schönsten Bücher, das *Thüringer Tagebuch*, mit sehr schönem Buchschmuck von Ernst Liebermann und viel reicherem Inhalt als der Titel ahnen lässt, sei nur eben erwähnt. Jene Kritik gelangt zu zwei hauptsächlichen Ergebnissen: zum Begriff der Heimatkunst und zur Auffassung von "Weimar" als Geistesstimmung oder Gemütszustand.

In den *Neuen Idealen* steht der bekannte grosse Aufsatz vom Jahre 1900: *Die Vorherrschaft Berlins*, worin Lienhard nicht eigentlich Los von Berlin! predigt und gegen Berlin als "naturalistischen und skeptischen Kunst- und Lebensbegriff" ankämpft, sondern vielmehr für eine Ergänzung Berlins eintritt, und zwar eine Ergänzung durch den Reichtum deutscher Landschaft. In diesem Aufsatz findet sich allerlei, was heute nicht mehr zutrifft, wertvoll ist aber heute noch Lienhards Eintreten für eine reife Heimatliebe in Leben und Literatur. Er meint damit ausdrücklich "das Stammesbewusstsein eines ins grosse Reich bewusst eingegliederten Reichsbürgers." Wenn er von dem "naiven Natursohn" redet, der in die Welt zieht und dann zurückkehrt "als der alte und doch ein anderer," so spricht er aus eigenster Erfahrung: wie der Deutschelsässer zum Reichsdeutschen geworden ist. Mit Lienhards Worten: "Er hat sein Fleckchen eingliedern gelernt ins grosse Reichsganze; er hat auch seine kleine Pflicht eingegliedert ins Weltganze."

Lienhard sucht nun das Geheimnis echter Poesie. Die Form, also Kunst im engeren Sinn, ist ihm nicht die Hauptsache. Die religiös-philosophische Grundstimmung der Seele und die Freiheit des Weltblicks machen den Künstler aus. "Erst aus grosser Weltanschauung fliesst grosse Kunstanschauung." Oder: "Menschentum gilt zuerst, dann erst die Kunst und die Form." Deshalb richtet er seine Zornesrufe gegen die "Literaturjünglinge mit der fein ziselierenden Hand, den schlechten Nerven und unfrischen Herzen." Der "revolutionären skeptischen Dichtung" gegenüber erklärt er sich für die "grosse Dichtung," die ihm Freudigkeit und Ruhe bedeutet. Als Heilmittel für die "Nervosität und dabei doch Inhaltlosigkeit des Tagesliteratentums" empfiehlt er eine literarische Kunst, die auf festerem Boden, auf festerer Weltanschauung als die sogenannte Moderne steht: *die Heimatkunst.*

Das Wort Heimatkunst stammt wohl von Adolf Bartels dem Literaturgeschichtsschreiber, aber was es bezeichnet, das ist im Grunde längst dagewesen. Wie das etwa Carl Weitbrecht in seiner *Deutschen Literaturgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*[1] darlegt. Lienhard u.a. hat es nur bewusst erkannt und ausgesprochen, wobei er dem Wort Heimat noch eine eigene Vertiefung gegeben hat. "Heimat —so schreibt er—ist schon der geistige und lebendige Umkreis, in dem sich eine Persönlichkeit eingebaut und abgezirkelt hat von der weiteren Umwelt; Heimat ist auch meine Gedankenwelt und die Welt meiner Kräfte, die ich mir erkämpft habe. . . . . Und für diese innere Heimat ist die sinnlich sichtbare Heimat mit ihren goldenen Äckern und Abendhimmeln, mit Mundarten und Trachten, mit gemeinsamen Sorgen und Freuden der Betätigungs- und der Nahrungsboden. Jene Innenwelt ohne fortwährende Berührung und Auffrischung durch diese farbige Aussenwelt wird abstrakt, dürr und blass; diese blosse Aussenwelt ohne Verinnerlichung ist niederer Kulturzustand, wenn ich auch noch so sehr . . . . an meiner Heimat hänge." Diese Auffassung von Heimat hat er auch poetisch bekannt, z.B. in dem Gedicht *Letzte Fahrt:*

Nicht Garizim, Burg Zion nicht,
Nicht Elsass noch der Nordsee Strand:
Mein unerforschlich Vaterland
Weiss ich in Gottes grossem Licht.

[1] Sammlung Göschen (Leipzig, 1908), Vierter Abschnitt: *Der poetische Realismus* und am Schluss des 2. Teils.

Heimatkunst soll keine "Stubenprobleme," nicht mehr blosse Technik und Symbolistik haben: "nicht Flucht aus dem Modernen, sondern . . . . eine Ergänzung, eine Erweiterung und Vertiefung nach der menschlichen Seite hin . . . . wir wünschen ganze Menschen mit einer ganzen und weiten Gedanken-, Gemüts- und Charakterwelt, mit modernster und doch volkstümlichster Bildung, mit national- und doch welthistorischem Sinn." Oder anders: "Heimatkunst ist eine Selbstbesinnung auf heimatliche Stoffe; in erster Linie aber ist sie Wesenserneuerung, ist sie Auffrischung durch Landluft. . . . . Mit dieser Geistesauffrischung wird freilich auch eine andere Stoffwahl, eine andere Sprache und Technik Hand in Hand gehen."

Lienhards hauptsächliche poetische Beiträge zur Heimatkunst sind: eine Komödie in drei Akten *Münchhausen* (1900 zuerst aufgeführt), die Trilogie *Till Eulenspiegel*, die 1896 begonnen und 1900 beendet wurde, und die dramatische Dichtung in sieben Szenen *Wieland der Schmied* (1905).

Münchhausen ist Lienhards phantasievollstes Stück, ein Lebensbild des klassischen Aufschneiders, dessen historisches Vorbild von 1720 bis 1791 gelebt hat. Lienhards Münchhausen ist aber nicht "eine spazierende Lüge oder eine bezopfte Illusion," sondern ein Mann von Phantasie, eine künstlerische Natur. Wie er selbst sagt: "Zu wenig Phantasie! Das ist ein Gebrechen . . . . der ganzen zivilisierten Welt." Oder in anderem Zusammenhang: "Ein *Esel* erlebt nur von aussen her ein Schock Tragödien oder Komödien und bleibt ein Esel. Ein *Genie* aber hört von einem entfernten Geschehnis—und erlebt es sofort mit, bis in Herz und Nieren hinein." Dieser Münchhausen ist mehr als "ein armer alter invalider Schlossherr und Edelmann," er wird als solchein Genie geradezu "Repräsentant der deutschen Bildung," d.h. vom Dichter in die vorklassische Zeit gerückt.

Menschlich und auch reinkünstlerisch und technischdramatisch noch bedeutender ist Lienhards *Till Eulenspiegel*. Der Schwankheld der deutschen Prosaliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts, der vagabundierende Spassmacher, stellt eine Art Standeskampf dar. Als Bauer kämpft er mit all seinem Mutterwitz gegen das aufsteigende Bürgertum seiner Tage. Aus dem, wenn man will, geschichtlichen und aus dem sagenhaften Till, der einfältige Bauernschlauheit mit

der Lebens- und Menschenkenntnis eines echten Humoristen verbindet, macht Lienhard einen Charakter im modernen Sinn, einen vollen lebendigen Menschen mit einem rechten Menschenschicksal.

Die drei Teile der dramatischen Dichtung heissen *Eulenspiegels Ausfahrt*, Schelmenspiel in drei Aufzügen, *Der Fremde*, Schelmenspiel in einem Aufzug, und *Eulenspiegels Heimkehr*, ein Schauspiel in drei Akten. Die *Ausfahrt* oder Wanderung in die Welt erklärt, warum Till in die Welt muss. Seine Familie weiss nichts mit ihm anzufangen. Der beratende Familientag der sämtlichen Eulenspiegel ist unwiderstehlich komisch. Till ist eben der Kuckuck unter den Spatzen, ein Idealist im Keime, der nicht in dieser Welt und einem weltlichen Beruf aufgehen, sondern frei sein will wie—sein Dichter. Als Idealist der alten Schule ist er Illusionist. So macht er sich selber etwas vor, wenn er aus Liebe zur Jugendgespielin "ganz gewiss ein braver Mensch werden" will. Auch sein guter Vorsatz wird ein Pflasterstein zum Weg in die Hölle, der er sich zuletzt nur noch eben durch Flucht entzieht. Der folgende Einakter *Der Fremde* ist ein kleines feines meisterliches Werk, das kraftvollste Drama Lienhards. Till erscheint in einem Dorfwirtshaus als Stotterer und narrt Wirt und Gäste, die sich als "Kluge" aufspielen. Das Schelmenspiel hat jedoch einen tragischen Untergrund: dieser Till hat bereits schwere Lebenserfahrungen hinter sich und er ist Hofnarr geworden. Er spielt mit Leben und Liebe. "Wer ich bin? Ein Bettler, ein König—*frei* hinfahrend wie der Wind auf der Heide!" Damit führt er uns zu einer Antwort auf die letzte Frage nach seinem Wesen. Er ist ruhelos wie das ganze spätere Mittelalter in Deutschland, als die sittliche Idee der Freiheit in der deutschen Seele wiedergeboren wurde. Er ist ein ewig Suchender wie Faust. Der dritte Teil der Trilogie bringt die tiefste tragische Ausdeutung des ganzen Charakters. Hier versetzt der Dichter ihn in eine spätere Zeit, den Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts, die beginnende Reformation, die Zeit der Bauernkriege und der allgemeinen sozialen Revolution Deutschlands. "Gegen die Zwingherren in Welt und Kirche" will der herrische Hofnarr kämpfen; er wird im Streit verwundet. Hans Sachs, der wandernde Nürnberger Schuster- und Dichtergeselle, rettet ihn vom Tode, vom leiblichen Tode wenigstens und vorläufig; denn geistig bricht er zusammen.

"Niedertracht dort und hier, Niedertracht überall. . . . . Bin weder Fürst noch Bauer—verrottet beide! . . . . Nenne mir eine Menschengattung, die ich lieben könnte! Pack alle!" Das verzeichnet das Ergebnis seines Wanderns. Hans Sachs, den ihm das Schicksal zum Weggenossen und Freund gegeben hat, will ihn trösten: "Lieber Wegwart, es ist eine schandbar wüste Zeit, da hast du recht. Aber die Sonne wird wieder scheinen! Und bis dahin bleibt uns ein lieblich Amt: nämlich selber Sonne zu sein und Freude zu verbreiten, so weit unser Bezirk reicht!" Es ist letzten Endes Lienhards Mahnung: Heimatkultur—Heimatkunst. Für Till Eülenspiegel ist es zu spät. Wohl kehrt er in sein Dorf zurück. Sein letzter Wunsch ist: "Still will ich nun sein und arbeiten. . . . . Fein stille. . . . ." Und Hans Sachs ruft voller Freude: "Den absonderlichsten Sonderling Deutschlands hab ich wohlbehalten ans Ziel gebracht!" Till ist heimgekehrt, aber nur um zu sterben.[1]

Dass Lienhard den Begriff Heimatkunst weit fasste, geht auch aus seiner Wieland-Dichtung hervor. Hatte er in den *Neuen Idealen* erklärt: "Nicht an die 'moderne Gegenwart' ist also die Poesie, sei sie 'neu' oder 'alt,' gebunden; dieses Reich der Schönheit ist überall und immer, wo der Dichter seine Magie übt. Grenzenlos ist sein Reich." So fand er in der Wieland- oder besser der Wölandsage "wuchtige Trümmer einer Erzählung: wie sich Schmied Wölund für grausame Misshandlung (ihm werden die Sehnen seiner Füsse durchschnitten) grausam gerächt hat. Betrachtet man sie nüchtern und sachlich, so fordert sie nicht zu symbolischer Auffassung heraus. Und dennoch ist uns Modernen Wielands Höhenflug aus den Tiefen des Schmerzes ein bedeutsamer Mythus." Wieland schmiedet sich Fittige—ein Federgewand "von seiner Not getrieben"—und fliegt seinem Quäler fort . . . . der Sonne zu . . . . oder "in ein sonniges Land, wo seine Kunst unbefangene Menschen findet." In Lienhards Dichtung ist dargestellt, wie Wieland durch seine Liebe zur Walküre Allwiss emporgehoben wird aus seinem Halbmenschentum. Um so schlimmer ist dann natürlich sein Sturz und um so grösser sein letzter Aufstieg. "Dieser Wieland hat innere Macht" sagt Bodwild, die andere Frau, die ihn liebt: "O—

[1] Lienhards Gedicht *Eulenspiegel auf der Winterheide* hilft den Charakter seines Eulenspiegels erklären; Till seufzt da: "*Narr* darf ich nur, nicht *Sänger* sein!"

und nun ein Krüppel! Dieser Menschheit, die keine Männer mehr hat, ist ein Held genommen!" Wieland, der "Mann der Schmerzen," muss sich selbst überwinden, sein "Herz heilen." Alrune, die Waldfrau, rät ihm, beschwört ihn: "Schmiede den Schmerz!" Und er schmiedet sich frei.

Wieland der Schmied hatte eine grosse Wirkung im Harzer Bergtheater, d.i. auf der Naturbühne, die 1903 von Ernst Wachler gegründet worden ist, und dort ist es jahrelang das am meisten gespielte Stück geblieben. Auf der geschlossenen Bühne hat es nicht die gleiche Wirkung erzielt; und wenn es nicht ein grosses Drama ist, bedeutet es jedenfalls eine gute Dichtung, die ebenso wie Lienhards längere Einleitung dazu höchst lesenswert ist.

Das genüge für Lienhards Heimatkunst in Lehre und Vorbild, im engeren oder mehr landschaftlichen und im weiteren geistigeren Sinn. Zu Lienhards Begriff von "Weimar" müssen wir vor allem seine *Wege nach Weimar* heranziehen, seinen bis jetzt bedeutendsten Beitrag zur Literaturbetrachtung. Die sechs Bände dieser *Wege nach Weimar* erschienen zunächst in Monatsheften von 1905 bis 1908. In der 2. Auflage 1910–11 ist die volle Buchform hergestellt, indem die zusammengehörigen Aufsätze in Gruppen vereinigt wurden. Man hat es aber nicht mit einer Zeitschrift, sondern mit einem selbständigen Werk des Verfassers zu tun, der "eine höhere Geistesstimmung herauszuarbeiten bemüht" war: das was er "Weimar" nennt. Er betrachtet Weimar nicht nur "nach der räumlichen Vorstellung" etwa als anmutiges Residenzstädtchen im Ilmtal und ebensowenig nur "nach seiner historischen Idee," d.h. als gemeinschaftliche Heimat von Goethe, Schiller und Herder. Es ist ihm nicht um den Ort und das Wort zu tun. Das eigentlich Wertvolle und Lebendige ist ihm Weimars *Wirkung*. Er schreibt:

> Das Wort "Weimar" erhält erst wie die Worte "Wartburg," "Sanssouci," "Hellas"—Leben und Sinn, wenn es in jedem von uns ähnliche Kräfte erzeugt, wie sie dort lebendig gewesen. Und so bedeutet uns denn das magische Wort nur das Verständigungszeichen für einen feiner menschlichen Zustand: und zu diesem den Aufweg zu versuchen, ist der wahre Weg nach Weimar.

Es ist der Weg in die schöpferische Stille, zur ästhetischen Kultur. Und er sagt erläuternd: "In herzlicher Anteilnahme von den Dingen

der Erde frei sein und sie mit künstlerisch verfeinertem und sittlich geläutertem Geist beherrschen, d.i. das Ziel der ästhetischen Kultur."

Es geht "eine historische Grundlinie" durch alle diese Unterhaltungen, Studien und Betrachtungen. Heinrich von Stein und Emerson (Band I) geben die allgemein-geistige, Shakespeare und Homer (II) die allgemein-ästhetische Grundlage. In Friedrich dem Grossen und Kant (III) erscheint die heroische Linie, daran fügt sich (in Band IV) die weichere Welt eines Herder und Jean Paul; die Reihe schliesst mit Schiller (V) und Goethe (VI). Mit diesen Namen ist immer nur die Überschrift des betreffenden Bandes gegeben. In den Bänden befinden sich noch zahlreiche Aufsätze über Dichter wie Hölderlin, Scheffel, Raabe oder Byron, Thoreau und Whitman, über Denker wie Rousseau, Nietzsche und Gobineau oder ganze Literaturgebiete, z.B. über das Märchen oder altenglische Balladen.[1] Wie Lienhard im letzten Band gesteht: "Es steckt Fülle von Arbeit und Nachdenken, das darf man wohl ruhig aussprechen, in diesen Heften, die durchweg auf die Quellen zurückgehen, aber alles Gelehrte zu vermeiden suchen." Es ist Wissenschaft in "erlebniswarme Weisheit" verwandelt. In einem wertvollen Vortrag über Parsifal und Zarathustra, der 1914 erschien, rechnet sich der Verfasser "nicht zu den Gralforschern, sondern zu den Gralsuchern," so kann man ihn nach seinen *Wegen nach Weimar* einen Literatursucher nennen. Er ist kein akademischer Forscher, auf das Erleben kommt ihm alles an. Als selbtschaffender Künstler ist er "Phantasie- und Seelenmensch," d.h. ein Mensch des Erlebnisses, der die Kunst "hat," in sich trägt, und deshalb ein sicherer Führer zur echten Literatur.

Lienhards *Wege nach Weimar* sind ein "Werk der Stille." Diese stillen, starken Gedanken eines freien Literaturbetrachters haben sich auch in anderer Form vor die Öffentlichkeit gewagt. So haben wir ein entzückendes Büchelchen *Das klassische Weimar* (1909), das aus Vorlesungen in Jenaer Ferienkursen hervorgegangen ist, und

[1] Man vergleiche mit den *Wegen nach Weimar* etwa die *Shelburne Essays* von Paul Elmer More und man versteht den Unterschied zwischen deutscher und amerikanischer Literaturbetrachtung besser. Bei More zuerst englische dann amerikanische Literatur, dann Philosophie aus England und Amerika, auch etwas Griechenland, aus Frankreich Pascal, Rousseau, Ste. Beuve, schliesslich Tolstoy und Nietzsche. In Band VI ist deutsche Religionsphilosophie, ohne Frage die bedeutendste unter den modernen, nicht einmal erwähnt.

nicht zuletzt eine neue tiefe und echt Lienhardsche Erläuterung von Goethes Faust.[1] In dem Buch über *Das klassische Weimar* lesen wir z.B.: "Darin gerade besteht die Aufgabe des Klassizismus (Schiller–Goethe), dem Poesie mehr ist als Unterhaltung, mehr als schöne Form, mehr als Schilderungswerk und Problematik, in welch letzteren Dingen so viele von uns stecken bleiben, ohne ins Freie zu gelangen: in das Land der klaren Ruhe und des tiefen Vertrauens." Das stimmt überein mit einem schönen Wort aus dem ersten Band der *Wege nach Weimar:* "Poesie öffnet sich nur dem Gläubigen, d.h. der herzlichen Unbefangenheit, der offenen Seele."

Lienhards reifstes und gelesenstes Buch ist endlich *Oberlin, Roman aus der Revolutionszeit im Elsass.* Das ist nicht nur ein Heimatroman im Sinne etwa von Frenssens *Jörn Uhl*, sondern ein bedeutender Kulturroman, in dem wir viel zum Verständnis der Zeit von Schiller und Goethe lernen können, und er wird so schliesslich ein Bekenntnis zum deutschen Idealismus, wie Lienhard ihn in seinen Prosaschriften immer und immer wieder vertreten hat. So hiess es am zusammenfassendsten in einem Vortrag von Jahre 1910: *Was ist deutscher Idealismus?*, den man auch in den *Neuen Idealen* findet: "Deutscher Idealismus ist Besiegung der deutschen Schwere. Durch welche Mittel? Durch die rhythmische Kraft eines reinen Herzens und grosser Gedanken!"

Das innere Ziel dieser Geschichte ist Johann Friedrich Oberlin, der von 1740 bis 1826 im Elsass lebte, ein bedeutender Pfarrer und ungewöhnlicher Mann. "Es ist die Geschichte eines jungen Elsässers, des Kandidaten Viktor Hartmann, der aus anfänglich dumpfen und verworrenen Zuständen zu Oberlins Ruhe und Reife hinanwächst." So schreibt der Verfasser selbst im Vorwort zu seinem Roman. Der Roman gliedert sich in drei Bücher, diese entsprechen drei seelischen Stufen und Seelenstimmungen. Zuerst die breit behagliche ästhetisch empfindsame Zeit vor der französischen Revolution, dann die Revolution in Strassburg, in dem die Geburtsstunde der Marseillaise und der Dichter Rouget de l'Isle geschildert sind, und endlich

[1] Seitdem ist noch von Lienhard erschienen: *Deutsche Dichtung in ihren geschichtlichen Grundzügen dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1917), bei Quelle & Meyer, als Band 150 von der Sammlung "Wissenschaft und Bildung."

Steintal, d.h. die religiöse deutschelsässische Stimmung nach der Revolution. Der Roman hat vielen Gehalt an Schönheit und Tiefsinn, seine Luft ist bei aller Darstellung tiefster Seelenprobleme rein, da es keine artistische Erotik darin gibt. Seine Menschen wachsen alle vom Grenzland hinaus und ins Hochland hinein: "in das Land der grossen Herzen . . . . worin es weder Angst noch Hass noch Tod gibt, sondern Mut und Leben, Licht und Liebe!" Und das Geheimnis Oberlins und zugleich Lienhards Wunsch wird in dem Satz ausgesprochen: "In stiller Tätigkeit und vornehmer Gesinnung sein Leben auch im Kleinen für das grosse Ganze bedeutend zu machen—kann es ein reineres Glück geben?!"

Still und einsam sind Lienhards Lieblingsbegriffe. Von "moderner Vereinsamung" redet ein Aufsatz im I. Bande der *Wege nach Weimar* und fordert "eine Umgestaltung des ganzen Zeitgeistes," aber "keine Weltflucht, sondern ein Sich-Selber-Finden." Dieselbe Forderung von steter, stiller Selbstzucht bringen die *Neuen Ideale* verschiedentlich zum Ausdruck, beispielsweise: "Wer es mit seinem Volke und dessen Kultur und Literatur ernst meint, der muss sich vor allen Dingen zu einer gewissen—ich sage nur: zu einer gewissen—Einsamkeit erziehen. Anders ist ein Beherrschen und Überschauen nicht möglich!" Von solcher edlen Einsamkeit redet nun auch sein letztes Buch, dessen Vorwort von Oktober 1914 stammt: *Der Einsiedler und sein Volk.*[1] Es ist eine Sammlung von Erzählungen, denen die erste Geschichte, eine Art Kriegsbekenntnis Lienhards, den Titel gegeben hat. Die beste Erzählung darin heisst: *Aus Taulers Tagen,* eine historische Novelle über einen von Lienhards Lieblingshelden aus dem Elsass der Mystik. "Den Sinn des Lebens kann man nur erleben, nicht erlernen. . . . . Und dazu gehört, dass unser Gemüt selber auf den stillen Grund getaucht sei." Wir sind wieder auf dem Wege nach Weimar.

Zusammenfassend könnte man sagen, dass Lienhard als Lyriker wie als Dramatiker von edler Zartheit und Keuschheit des Empfindens ist, im Gefühlsausdruck herb, ja streng, voll von reinstem Wollen und von hohen würdigen Gedanken, ein Dichter der ewigen

[1] Lienhard hat 1919 einen Roman aus dem gegenwärtigen Elsass: *Westmark* veröffentlicht, der einen nachhaltigen Eindruck gemacht hat und viel gelesen wird, deshalb besondere Aufmerksamkeit verdient.

seelischen Sehnsucht, der Klarheit und Liebe, der Stille und Einsamkeit. Sein grösster Gegensatz in der modernen deutschen Literatur dürfte Gerhart Hauptmann sein, was ein Vergleich von Lienhards Dichtung *Odysseus auf Ithaca* (1911) mit Hauptmanns *Der Bogen des Odysseus* (1913) ebenso interessant wie lehrreich beweisen kann.[1] Das sollte wenigstens *ein* Ergebnis zeitigen, dass man die modernste deutsche Literatur nicht mehr nur nach Hauptmann sondern auch nach Lienhard beurteilen muss. Lienhard ist nicht immer naivschaffender Dichter. Er erreicht sein Höchstes nicht oft, weil er zu viel denkt, d.h. als formender Künstler zu viel denkt, zu viel grübeln und Ergrübeltes aussprechen will. Aber alles was er sagt ist bedeutend als Ausdruck einer harmonischen männlichen Persönlichkeit. Was etwa Rudolf Eucken als Denker für die neudeutsche Weltanschauungskunde bedeutet, was etwa Oskar Walzel in unserm eigensten Fachgebiet als literarischer Kritiker darstellt, das leistet Friedrich Lienhard für die Literaturbetrachtung in einem allgemeinen Sinn, und zwar als künstlerische Persönlichkeit. Doch während Oskar Walzel z.B. Kunstverstand ist, dessen Ziel allerdings Stärkung des künstlerischen Gefühls sein will, also vertieftes Kunstverständnis, vertritt Friedrich Lienhard fühlendes Dichtertum . . . . das volle frische Herz. Und gerade heute, wenn deutsche Forscher dem Problem der "Künstlerischen Form des Dichtwerks" nachspüren, brauchen wir eine Dichterpersönlichkeit wie Lienhard zum Helfer und Anreger. Gerade Friedrich Lienhards Literaturbetrachtung kann uns Lehrenden und Lernenden das eine Grosse vermitteln, dass es in der Kunst wie in der Kunstkritik nicht auf die analytische Schilderung ankommt, sondern vielmehr auf das Ringen um ein Ideal. Der Wissenschaftler wie der Künstler muss etwas *sein*—das blosse Wissen oder Können genügt nicht.

F. SCHOENEMANN

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, 1913–20
ADOLFSTRASSE 54, KIEL, GERMANY

[1] Siehe jetzt die Greifswalder Dissertation von P. Gaude: *Das Odysseusthema in der neueren deutschen Literatur besonders bei G. Hauptmann und F. Lienhard.* Leipzig, 1916. Verlag G. Fock.

NIFLANT, IFLANT

Dô sprach von Nîflande Môrunc der junge man

The name *Niflant* in the above line from *Kudrun* (211, 1) is generally recognized as a variant form of *Livland*, and Martin, in his note on the passage, cites a number of other literary monuments in which this spelling occurs. It seems not to have been noticed, however, that *Nifflant* is the only form found in the Statutes of the Teutonic Order, under whose dominion Livland remained for several centuries. This document, promulgated by the Grand Master Werner von Orseln, is dated September 17, 1329. Its dialect is Middle German:

> Auch so mach derselbe meister zu Duitschen landen . . . . den meister zu Nifflant auch in mitwissen lassen haben (p. 233). . . . . dez meisters zu Duitschen landen und Nifflanden (p. 235). . . . . verhengnisze eins meisters van Duitschen landen und auch eins meisters zu Nifflanden (*ibid.*) ein meister van Nifflant mit allen sinen und anderen gebietgern des landes zu Prusen (*ibid.*). . . . . der gebietiger und brueder van Pruesen, auch van Nifflant (p. 240). Wie ein meister zu Nifflant auch ein mitwissen mag und sal haben (p. 241). . . . . die wile ein meister zu Nifflant auch der oberste gebietiger einer ist (*ibid.*). . . . . mach er den meister zu Nifflant, der do zu den zeiten isz, beruffen (*ibid.*). Ob aber derselbe meister zu Niffland nicht komen en moichte (p. 242). Were auch sache das derselbe meister zu Nifflant . . . . nicht queme . . . . als were der meister zu Nifflant . . . . selbe gheenwartich gewiest . . . . als were der meister zu Nifflant . . . . gegenwirtich (*ibid.*) prueder Eberhart van Minheim, meister zu Nifflant (p. 243).[1]

The form *Liflant*, while frequent in other documents of this period, does not occur at all in these Statutes, which long continued to be the fundamental law of the Teutonic Order. *Nifflant*, therefore, instead of being a mere sporadic variant, is to be regarded as a regular, current form. An off-shoot from the spelling *Niflant*, namely *Iflant*, *Ifflant*, seems hitherto to have escaped notice, despite the fact that it occurs very frequently in documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The earliest instances are in a legal summons

[1] Published in F. G. v. Bunge's *Liv-, Est- und Curländisches Urkundenbuch*, Zweiter Band, Reval, 1855, pp. 233 ff.

addressed to the Teutonic Order by Magnus, Bishop of Westerås, under date of September 15, 1354:

. . . . und allen brudern und iren icklichem in Iflande wesenden (*ac fratribus universis et cuilibet ipsorum, per Livoniam constitutis*), (Bunge, II, 596). czerungen und becostungen czu den teilen kegen Iflant (p. 598). ufgehalden, gewangen, ader welcherwis bekumert in der jegent Iflande (p. 601).

In the year 1370, King Waldemar of Denmark addresses a letter to the "ratman der gemeinen stede van der Wend siden, von Prusen, von Yflande und von der Sudirse" (Bunge, VI, 658).

In 1387 the Master of the Order in Livonia sends instructions to his representative at the Papal Court, in which the form *Ifland* is used exclusively:

mitzamt unsem vulbort und unser mitgebitiger zu Ifland (Bunge, III, 545). unser brudere in Iflande (*ibid.*). eine zuvorsicht unsers ordens in Iflande (*ibid*). unser mitgebitiger in Ifland (p. 546). uf die materie der zachen unseres bannes in Ifland (*ibid.*). zu uns in Iflande (p. 547). uns und unsern orden in Iflande (*ibid.*).

Similarly, in the official correspondence of the Emperor Sigismund the spelling *Ifland*, together with its variants (*Yflant, Yffland, Yflannd*), is almost exclusively used, a single instance of *Leyffland* constituting the exception:

den ganczen Deutschen orden in Preussen und ouch in Yffland (Bunge, VII, 94: dated 1424). prelaten, in Preussen und in Yffland geseszen (p. 95). den erwirdigen hoemeistern in Preussen und in Yffland und irem orden (*ibid.*). der erwirdig meister von Yflant Deutsches ordens (VIII, 55: 1429). der lande czu Prussen und czu Yffland (VIII, 454: 1434). meister von Leyffland . . . . hertzog Swidrigal und den Yfflenndern . . . . dem meister von Yflannd (pp. 542 f.: 1435). die niderlag des erwirdigen meisters von Ifland (p. 618: 1435). von der Yfflender wegen (p. 619). ouch der ritterschafft und steten in Iffland (*Monumenta*,[1] XIV, 533: 1435). dem groszfursten und dem meister von Yffland (p. 544).

In a letter of September 6, 1434, addressed to the Grand Master by Hans Balg (Bunge, VIII, 499–501), we note the forms *czů Yflande, von Yflande, dy Yflender, dy Iflander, dy Iflender, czů Yflande, von Iflant, dy Iflander, dy Iflander, mit den Iflender.* The form *von Yfflanden* is found in Bunge, IX, 133 (1437), while *ken Yfflandt, in Yfflandt* occur four times in a document of the year 1449 (Bunge, X, 455). This list may be concluded by noting the additional forms

[1] *Monumenta medii aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia*, Tomus XIV, Cracoviae, 1894.

marschalk van Iffelant and *marschalk von Iffilant* (*Monumenta*, XIV, 512 f.: 1431).

As to dialect, it may be noted that the form *Ifland*, like its predecessor *Niffland*, occurs almost exclusively in Middle and Upper German documents, whereas Low German texts always have *Lifland*, or a similar spelling with initial *L*. The two forms *Ifland* and *Lifland* hardly ever appear in the same document—the most striking exception to this statement is to be noted in a letter of the year 1410, in which there are also other indications of a mixture of dialects (Middle and Low German):

dat ir mir behulplich sin an den mester von Yfflande, das her mich zo wissen do (Bunge, IV, 746). Dar uf ret ik an euwir genate ind noch euwirn willen to Lifflande (*ibid.*). di mich obir gengen obir al Yfland (p. 747). das ich ene erfolget hette in Yfland (*ibid.*). So bin ich uis Yffland geriten ind en ger nicht mer (*ibid.*).

The spellings *Niffland*, *Ifland*, *Iffelant*, *Iffilant*, and the like would seem to indicate a short stem-vowel: on the other hand, only a long stem-vowel could have produced the diphthongized form *Eifland*. Rud. Hildebrand,[1] who cites this form from a text of the sixteenth century, explains it by positing a form *Neifland*, which lost its *N* through combinations like *von Neifland*, *in Neifland*. As far as I know, not a single instance of *Neifland* can be cited; nor is it necessary now to posit this form, as *Ifland* with which Hildebrand was unacquainted, sufficiently accounts for *Eifland*. The loss of the initial *N* is paralleled in the name of Heinrich von Notleben, which is found in Bunge in more than a dozen different spellings, including *Otleben* (IX, 222), *Otleyben* (p. 334), and *Otloffen* (p. 177). Similarly, the name of the county of Ortenau in Baden had, as late as the fifteenth century, an initial *M*: *Mordenau*, *Mortenau*.[2]

The following early instances of *Eifland*, *Eifländer*, *Eifländisch* may be noted:

daz die Eyflender die selbin weile in dem lande gehert haben . . . . do sie in das lant komen, do worin die Eyflender weg (*Monumenta*, VI, 185: 1409). der kompthur czum Elbinge ken Eyffland (Bunge, X, 220: 1447). das dye cleynen freyen . . . . ken Eyfland mit nichte czyen wellen (p. 224). was mich dy Eyfflendesche reysze gekost hat (p. 454: 1449). uff die Eyfflandesche hervart (*ibid.*).

[1] "Zur Gudrun," *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Phil.*, II, 477.

[2] *Publikationen aus den Preuss. Staatsarchiven*, LIX, 565.

The last variant to be noted is *Eyfenland,* in a text of the year 1432: "sageten, her were dovon komen und kein Eyfenland geflogen."[1]

As giving a possible clue to the origin of the form *Nifland,* Martin, in the note referred to above, states that the Russian name of the province is *Infland.* I am unable to confirm this, as the Russian dictionaries at my command give only *Liwonja* or *Lifljandja;* in Polish, however, the form *Inflanty* is regularly used, occurring frequently, for example, in Vol. VI of the *Monumenta:*

aby zbrojnie kroczyli do Inflant (p. 42). gdy i mistrz Inflancki jego poddanym dozwolił tegoż w Inflanciech (p. 49). Mistrz Inflancki Dietrich Tork przyrzeka w. ks. Witołdowi (p. 304).

W. KURRELMEYER

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

[1] *Scriptores rerum Silesiacarum,* VI, 116.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Theodor Fontane: A Critical Study. By KENNETH HAYENS. London: W. Collins & Co., 1920.

The technical side of novel-writing has elicited in recent years an uncommon amount of scholarly interest. A bibliography of essays, largely doctoral dissertations from German universities, which deal with the more technical aspects of the novelist's craft, has swelled to considerable proportions. Many of these essays bear, as far as general method and use of terminology are concerned, a recognizable relationship to Robert Riemann's *Goethes Romantechnik* (1902). Studies, more or less technical, in the art of fiction or the methods of individual novelists were, of course, available previous to the publication of Riemann's work, such as Spielhagen's *Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik des Romans* (1883), and indeed by 1915 in such numbers as to justify M. L. Wolff in writing a history of the theory of the novel (*Geschichte der Romantheorie*), but in providing a systematic method of investigation, a classification of the various elements of technique in a form at once graspable and generally applicable, Riemann appears much in the light of a pioneer. Obviously the novel can never be reduced to so compact a formula as that which Freytag with some plausibility derived from his study of the drama, yet the detailed studies of *Romantechnik* may eventually afford the possibility of a synthesis of general principles as to the craft of the novelist which, substantially attested and documented, may be of very great value. A recent addition to the studies of the German novel, to a large extent on the technical side, is Kenneth Hayens's *Theodor Fontane: A Critical Study* (London, 1920)—Hayens is Lecturer in German Language and Literature at University College, Dundee.

Hayens's prefatory note contains his bibliography. A selected bibliography is open to criticism both for inclusions and omissions, and satisfies perhaps no one except the compiler. Hayens' bibliography contains only ten items; several of them are references to such general and obvious authorities as the histories of literature by Meyer, Stern, and Biese, or Mielke's *Der deutsche Roman;* he uses one item to condemn Pineau's *L'Evolution du Roman en Allemagne au XIXe Siècle* as valueless for the study of Fontane, and at the end he notes several magazine articles which he characterizes mildly as "not unsuggestive." The student of Fontane would doubtless recommend various substitutions or additions, such as, perhaps, the essays of Ettlinger (Berlin, 1904) and F. Servaes (Berlin, without date). In view of the fact that Hayens is so largely concerned with the technique of Fontane's stories, one misses a reference to Kricker's study in the Bonner

Forschungen: *Theodor Fontane, von seiner Art und epischen Kunst* (1912), in which Kricker has trodden some kindred pathways before Hayens and brings forward a good deal of highly interesting material. Perhaps the most conspicuous omission is that of Dresch's book *Le Roman Social en Allemagne 1850–1900* (Paris, 1903), which devoted 128 pages to Fontane, the most extended account of Fontane's novels before Wandrey's *Theodor Fontane* (München, 1919); the latter probably appeared too late for Hayens to include.

Despite the inclusive promise of the title, Hayens's study deals only with Fontane as a novelist; in a brief introduction he compresses into the space of six pages a biography of Fontane and a survey, hardly more than an enumeration, of his non-fictional work. Because of this brevity, he fails to give appropriate emphasis to various avenues of approach to Fontane's real career, for example, his apprenticeship to narrative writing in his ballads. For the practical purpose of chapter divisions Hayens is naturally obliged to abandon Meyer's simple classification of the novels under two heads, "criminal novels" and "modern novels" (experimentelle, social-psychologische, kulturhistorische), and considers the stories under the following headings: "The Historical Novelist," "The Story-teller," "The New World," "Berlin Plutocracy," "Unequal Marriages," "Sentiment and Society," "Poor Nobility," "A Liberal Conservative." This grouping of the novels which violates the chronological sequence of their publication would be the natural procedure, were Hayens concerned exclusively with the themes of the stories and not with their technique, but this plan is likely to lead to some confusion in those passages where Hayens calls attention to the development of Fontane's technical methods; for example, in the chapter "The Historical Novelist" Hayens frequently compares *Schach von Wuthenow* with *Vor dem Sturm*, not simply as historical novels but in matters of technique, ignoring the fact that three novels were published between these two; unless the reader holds the chronological table in mind, he will probably gain the impression that *Schach von Wuthenow* was Fontane's second novel. In general Hayens shows a tendency to limit his comparisons to the group of stories which he considers in an individual chapter. It may be questioned also whether the unimportant novel *Quitt* deserves a chapter for itself, a doubt which is scarcely met by Hayens's plea that an author's failures merit study as well as his successes or that the book deserves special notice because of the novelty of the American scenes.

In his analysis of Fontane's novels Hayens tests each story on a series of points which he has chosen as constituting the technique of novel-writing; his method is simple and generally sound. He gives a brief outline of the plot which will serve for those who have never read the novels as an accurate indication of the kind of *story* which Fontane was wont to tell. Then the investigator analyzes each of the more important characters, and devotes a few words of comment to the minor personages; and by reference to

interpretative parallels and contrasts he opens the way for the establishment of general principles as to Fontane's favorite types and the strata of society from which his people are taken. He discusses also the various settings used in the stories, whether both outdoor and indoor scenes are used and in what relative proportions, and he compares one novel with others in this regard. Hayens fails to note Fontane's peculiar fondness for naming the pictures on the walls of his indoor settings; in this practice Fontane doubtless approaches the milieu-theorists and he probably derived from them an unconscious sense of the importance of this element in the setting.

Each novel is tested under the heading "proportion"; this consists in a quantitative measurement of the amount of recorded conversation as compared with the space devoted to action or reflective comment. Thus he says of *L'Adultera* (p. 131): "The general proportion of the novel is destroyed by the complete overshadowing of the action by the speech,"—a statement which Hayens makes in varying form in nearly every chapter of his book, though he fails to develop a theory as to the appropriate proportion of these elements. As a matter of fact this preponderance of conversation is the keynote of Fontane's realism; as in "real life," Fontane acquaints us with his people largely through what they say and what others say of them, and he is loath to assume the omniscience of the novelist who tells us what goes on behind the spoken word. In comment on the conversation as such, Hayens is sensible and acute in opposing the views frequently expressed to the effect that all of Fontane's characters talk alike without differentiation of speech, save for the few who, not always consistently, use dialect.

Hayens examines the different novels as to the number of characters in the different scenes and establishes Fontane's preference for scenes with only two persons or for considerably larger groups, his dislike of scenes with three or four persons. Discussion is also applied to Fontane's use of inserted letters, a practice which is with him more frequent than in the average modern novel, to the introduction of "extraneous matter," a point upon which a more precise definition of the term would seem to be required, the use of inserted poems, to passages where the author seems to take the reader into his confidence, and to the employment of foreign words; the latter are weighed quantitatively in each book, though Hayens does not indicate whether or not he has used Albin Schultz's dissertation *Das Fremdwort bei Theodor Fontane* (Greifswald, 1913). A further subject for discussion is the choice of title and of the names chosen for the characters. Hayens comments on the connotation or suggestiveness of names with considerable sensitiveness, but one wonders why he dismisses *Stine* as uninteresting in this regard, with Baron Papageno and Frau Pittelkow to uphold his theories.

In this study of technique there are unquestionably occasional lapses into platitudes and trivialities; Hayens is minded to make his study exhaustive

and, quite legitimately, has an eye to completeness even at the risk of including the petty. One interesting and characteristic element of Fontane's novels is overlooked or fails to receive due emphasis, namely, his use of the so-called "Leitmotiv," or of the foreshadowing suggestion, which is closely related to it. Hayens's attention might have been called to this rather noteworthy characteristic of Fontane's style by R. Sternfeld's essay "Das Leitmotiv bei Theodor Fontane" (*Beilage, Vossische Zeitung*, No. 343, 1910).[1] In several cases the investigator notes that Fontane ignores those climaxes of action which other novelists would have made the chief objects of their interest. This practice Hayens either does not interpret at all or explains unsatisfactorily; for example, in one instance, by attributing to Fontane's age his lack of interest in crises where the grand passion is involved. As a matter of fact again, these omissions indicate quite clearly certain conceptions of Fontane's as to the functions of the novel; he is not primarily concerned with great dramatic moments—that he leaves to the dramatist; he is mainly interested in processes of development which may lead up to them or result from them.

The concluding chapter will seem to most readers to be somewhat inadequate. Many general statements are scattered through the book, as it occurs to Hayens to generalize from points made with reference to a particular novel, for example, Fontane's comparative failure in depicting children; but he does not draw these fragments of a general characterization into a clear outline of his author in his final summation. Though Hayens remarks in his preface that Fontane is the chief German realist of the nineteenth century, he gives nowhere a clear conception of what he understands by realism nor how Fontane fulfils it. Hayens mentions Fontane's relationship to certain other novelists, his predecessors and contemporaries, such as Alexis, Hesekiel, Mauthner, and Lindau; he comments on a possible relationship to Young Germany on the one hand and to Zola and the Naturalists on the other, but in general his references are too brief to convey a really adequate or substantiated conception of how Fontane resembled or differed from those whose themes or whose methods were such as to make a comparison with Fontane's work significant, or to show Fontane's relation to his environment and the more important literary movements of his day. A much more detailed investigation of these problems would have enhanced the value of Hayens's book. In regard to social and literary backgrounds and Fontane's relationship to them, and, indeed, concerning various points of the novelist's technique, the volumes of Fontane's correspondence afford invaluable suggestions; Hayens directs attention to Fontane's autobiographical works but he does not seem to have used the abundant testimony of the correspondence as to Fontane's own estimate of values. The

[1] In a paper entitled "The *Leitmotiv* in German Literature" and read by Professor E. S. Meyer before the meeting of the Modern Language Association, Philadelphia, December 28, 1912, particular emphasis was laid on Fontane's use of this device.

significance of the final chapter would be much increased by a more extended attempt to sum up Fontane's character as a novelist, his temper and personality, the ideas and conceptions of life which underlie his novels, and his relationship to his world. Some of these points are admirably covered by Wandrey in his chapter entitled "Die geistige Persönlichkeit." Hayens controls his material with considerable skill, varying the order of the different elements of his investigation and enlivening the substance with illustrations. But, it would seem, the book fails to satisfy completely either of the two classes for which such a study might seem to be designed, the real student of the technique of fiction, particularly German fiction, and the general reading public which seeks merely a second-hand acquaintance with an important foreign author. Yet, as has been suggested above, Hayens's study contains unquestionably much which is interesting and stimulating to both types of readers.

HARVEY W. THAYER

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The Origin of the German Carnival Comedy. By MAXIMILIAN J. RUDWIN. New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1920. Pp. xii+85.

Man is forever fascinated by the search for origins. During the last half-century or so his tireless effort to penetrate into that confused labyrinth, primitive mind, has thrown much new and interesting light upon the great nucleus of all religion and art, the annual spring festival. The kernel of this universal vegetation or life-festival was everywhere the ritual celebration of the death, resurrection, and marriage of the life-dispensing Fertility-Spirit or Year-Spirit. Out of this ritual the drama developed: tragedy, as also comedy.

Since the investigations of Mannhardt, and since the application of his basic vegetation-spirit theory by Frazer in his *Golden Bough*, this connection of both tragedy and comedy with the rites and customs of the spring festival has become more and more manifest. Notwithstanding the ancestor-worship theory upheld by a few, the inclusive formulations of Jane Harrison and Gilbert Murray as regards classic tragedy, and of Cornford as regards classic comedy, are increasingly convincing.

In the discussions regarding the origin of our modern Teutonic, in particular English and German, drama, its patent association with the liturgical performances of biblical scenes in the Christian churches, and the later direct influence upon it of finished classical tragedy and comedy, have been stressed. There has as yet been no adequate realization of its still more fundamental connection with native tragic and comic forms, as determined by the native primitive spring ritual. The rapid development of the liturgical scenes into great mystery cycles played processionally, each year, by the town guilds in the town's public places, has always seemed

astonishing; and the fact that these cycles contained surprisingly rich presentations of contemporary life, both tragic and comic, has likewise been unexplained. The evolution of the farcical English interludes, of the morality plays, and of the characteristic English chronicle histories has always remained obscure.

Lately, however, investigators have begun to recognize the more fundamental native folk-determination of both the tragic and the comic scenes included in the great cycles, scenes so easily detachable often from the biblical context. Katherine Lee Bates, in her book *The English Religious Drama* still makes the traditional and superficially sweeping statement that "the romantic drama, born of the church and nourished by the church, came in time, as it acquired an independent life, and gradually passed from sacred to secular uses, to incur the hostility of the parent-bird, whose plumage its mischievous activity loved to ruffle." However, the beginnings made by Creizenach in discussing sword-plays, mummers' plays, and so forth, have been developed by Chambers, who has taken into account suggestions from the *Golden Bough;* yet he none the less fails to experience the full force of his own researches. Dr. Rudwin, on the other hand, after a thorough investigation into the origins of the drama in the West as in the East, reaches the following definite conclusion: "It would appear from the facts deduced that the . . . . folkplay has contributed more than the 'tiniest rill' (as Chambers puts it) to the mighty stream of modern drama."

Dr. Rudwin's book, therefore, is a most welcome sign of the times; a welcome beginning made in the careful investigation of a specific type, produced in the evolution of our modern drama. Even though Dr. Rudwin has confined himself to the German *Fastnachtsspiel*, his investigation throws light upon the whole problem, and suggests the timeliness of similar investigations for the farcical English interludes, and further for the morality plays, the chronicle histories, and, indeed, the entire "romantic" English or even European drama. There are phenomena and speeches in Shakespeare's plays which make it seem likely that the forms of Shakespearean tragedy and comedy were developments of the ritual of the native Spring Festival.[1] Thus Dr. Rudwin's book is of fundamental importance to anyone interested in the English drama, or in modern drama generally.

Dr. Rudwin starts from the now generally accepted assumption that the secular scenes developed independently of the liturgical plays, and attempts to discover the specific pagan ceremonies in which they may have originated. He assembles the meager records of Teutonic folk-customs of the past, supplements them by facts found in the practices and superstitions of the peasants of today, and compares them further with the customs and usages of present primitive peoples. Thus he tells of the annual ship-procession; of the death and resurrection and sacred marriage of the male

[1] The present writer is preparing a study of Shakespeare's plays approached from this point of view.

and female Fertility-Spirits; of the driving out of Winter or Death, and the bringing in of Summer or Life; and he tells, above all, of the dances, fooleries, and riotings of accompanying minor spirits.

The carnival season, Dr. Rudwin maintains, was a pagan carousing festival connected with the *carrus navalis* or ship-cart, symbol everywhere of the female Fertility-Spirit. The central fact of this universal agricultural festival, he says, was the ship-procession. Every spring, or Lent (the German *Lenz*), the ship was led in procession from place to place, in order to induce magically the renewal of life. This cart contained the emblem of fertility, or images of impersonations of the male or female Fertility-Spirits, either singly or together. It was drawn by beasts or humans, and accompanied by numerous other embodiments of fertility-power: these were the lesser spirits[1] who disported themselves in the manner of exuberant clowns, fools, or devils, doctors, priests, braggart soldiers, witches, scolds, all of these performing magical actions originally calculated to help along the new season's fertility. The author further gives a full description of these various Fertility-Spirits, discusses the black color of some of them, the caps and bells, the leaf-garments, the animal masks, the masks of death. Another part of this festival was the important ritual of the death and revival of the Fertility-God; by this death and resurrection ceremony primitive man explained the death and growth of vegetation. The mock killing of the leaf-clad mummer and his revival by the all-potent doctor was a necessary step toward rebirth in a younger and fresher form. A variant of the death and resurrection is the separation of the single Year-Spirit into two opposing principles—into a Winter or Death, and a Summer or Life; in this form Winter is driven out and Summer is brought in; or there is a contest between these two principles, between them singly or between the groups. Finally, likewise important in the ritual of the spring festival, was the celebration of a sacred marriage between the male and female Fertility-Spirits, accompanied by wholesale matings among the mummers and dancers and indeed all the celebrants.

After having given this detailed background, Dr. Rudwin nevertheless says that he does not believe that the carnival plays are direct outgrowths of any part of the actual ritual drama. "We can have drama only," the author insists, "when a wholly new content has been given to the ritual. . . . . The ritual part cannot be used, above all, for the comical drama." He suggests, however, that the secular plays developed, if not out of the sacred acts, at least out of the supplementary episodes extraneous to the magical rites. The fertility mummers, he thinks, who began by performing magical ceremonies intended to fertilize the earth and its varied life, very soon imitated and ridiculed individuals in the onlooking throng, and occupied themselves with the characters and conflicts of ordinary human life. Thus

[1] Dr. Rudwin calls them demons, but this term gives a false impression; it seems better to call them spirits.

the needed new content was provided. The author believes he has found parallels among the ancient Athenians and present-day American Indians. Of course, these buffoons also borrowed themes and types from the ritual drama; and this fact makes the preceding full discussion of the spring customs necessary and valuable. The obscenity of the medieval drama must be explained, Dr. Rudwin thinks, by its origin as a part of the fertility ceremonies.

Undoubtedly Dr. Rudwin fails to appreciate the importance of the ritual drama as to its influence in molding the plot-formulas of tragedy and comedy. This, however, can be explained by the fact that he has given his specific attention to the farcical carnival plays of Germany. His analysis, nevertheless, illuminates most interestingly the development of realistic comic scenes on the medieval stage, and also the fascinating type of the fool, who in Shakespeare is lifted into truly cosmic significance far removed and yet identical with his no less cosmic origin.

Thus Dr. Rudwin's study is the first definite clear attempt to show the continuous development of Teutonic drama out of native pagan traditions, in particular, the traditions connected with the ritual of the spring festival. It is greatly to be hoped that similar investigations will indeed be made for English tragedy and comedy, forms so much more important and interesting than the likewise important and interesting German *Fastnachtsspiel* studied in Dr. Rudwin's monograph.

LOUISE MALLINCKRODT KUEFFNER

HUNTER COLLEGE
NEW YORK CITY

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *March 1921* NUMBER 11

"AND THE EVENING AND THE MORNING WERE ONE DAY"

Paradiso, XXVII, 136–38

St. Augustine tells us that the angels are not omitted from the account of the creation in Genesis, but where it is said: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," "heaven" signifies spiritual beings in a potential state, just as "earth" signifies material creatures in an unformed state. And where it is said: "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light," the word "light" signifies the angels in their actual condition.[1]

. . . . non mihi videtur ab operibus Dei absurda sententia, si cum lux illa prima facta est, Angeli creati intelliguntur, et inter sanctos Angelos et immundos fuisse discretum, ubi dictum est: "Et divisit Deus inter lucem et tenebras; et vocavit Deus lucem diem, et tenebras vocavit noctem. . . . ."[2]

The light, then, and the day are the angels, and the darkness and the night are the sinning angels, as soon as they are separated from the good. So also says St. Isidore: "Angelica natura, quae non est

[1] Cf. Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXVII, Art. IV: "Augustinus enim (*De Civ. Dei* Lib. XI, cap. ix et xxxiii) videtur dicere quod non fuerit conveniens Moysem praetermisisse spiritualis creaturae productionem. Et ideo dicit quod cum dicitur: *In principio creavit Deus coelum et terram*, per coelum intelligitur materia informis corporalis creaturae. Et quia natura spiritualis dignior est quam corporalis, fuit prius formanda. Formatio igitur spiritualis naturae significatur in productione lucis, ut intelligatur de luce spirituali. Formatio enim naturae spiritualis est per hoc quod illuminatur ut adhaeret Verbo Dei."

[2] S. Aur. Augustini *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. xix. *Op. omn.* ed. Caillau and Guillon, Paris, 1836, Vol. III, p. 32.

prevaricata, lux dicitur; illa autem quae prevaricata est tenebrarum nomine nuncupatur. Unde et in principio lux a tenebris dividitur."[1]

This was a favorite idea with St. Augustine, which he discusses in many chapters of his *De Genesi ad litteram* and his *De Civitate Dei* as well as in other works; and with it is intimately connected his doctrine of the "evening and morning knowledge" of the angels. For how came it that some of the angels deviated from the light, became darkness, and were called "night"; while the others were called "day"? It happened in this way: The angels (who are altogether spiritual creatures, and so do not understand by means of abstractions from sense-images, as do human beings) have two kinds of knowledge. They see all things, including themselves, as they are in the Divine Wisdom which creates them, by gazing directly upon the light of Divine Wisdom, and this is their more perfect kind of knowledge. They also see all things, including themselves, as these creatures are in themselves, and this is their less perfect kind of knowledge. The more perfect is called "morning" knowledge, the less perfect "evening" knowledge.[2] When God said "Let there be light" he recalled his spiritual creatures from their contemplation of themselves as they were in themselves, to the contemplation of all things in him, and all but a minority converted their gaze upon him, gratefully acknowledging their own being from him, and ascribing all the creation to his praise. They thus acquired their full perfection.[3] The minority, on the contrary, refused to convert their gaze upon him, but continued to contemplate themselves and the rest of the creation as they were

[1] S. Isidori *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. viii, *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne), Tom. V, No. 129.

[2] Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LVII, Art. VI: "Respondeo dicendum quod hoc quod dicitur de cognitione matutina et vespertina in angelis, introductum est ab Augustino. . . . . Sicut autem in die consueto mane est principium diei, vespere autem terminus; ita cognitio ipsius primordialis esse rerum dicitur cognitio matutina; et haec est secundum quod res sunt in Verbo. Cognitio autem ipsius esse rei creatae secundum quod in propria natura consistit, dicitur cognitio vespertina. Nam esse rerum fluit a Verbo sicut a quodam primordiali principio; et hic effluxus terminatur ad esse rerum quod in propria natura habet."

[3] Augustine *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. vii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 14): "Quoniam scientia creaturae in comparatione scientiae Creatoris quodammodo vesperascit: itemque lucescit et mane fit, cum et ipsa refertur ad laudem dilectionemque Creatoris; nec in noctem vergitur, ubi non Creator creaturae dilectione relinquitur. . . . . Cognitio quippe creaturae in se ipsa decoloratior est, ut ita dicam, quam cum in Dei Sapientia cognoscitur, velut in arte qua facta est. Ideo vespera congruentius quam nox dici potest: quae tamen, ut dixi, cum ad laudandum et amandum refertur Creatorem, recurrit in mane. . . . ."

in themselves, rejoicing in their beauty, and refusing to acknowledge that beauty from God. They preferred their "evening" knowledge to their "morning" knowledge, and aspired to obtain by themselves that perfection which the majority gained by conversion to their "morning" knowledge. Then it happened that the "evening" knowledge of the rebellious angels became darkened, and turned to "night."[1] But the holy angels who obeyed the summons to convert their gaze did not on that account lose their "evening" knowledge, for they have both "morning" and "evening" knowledge combined in their "day" knowledge, as they contemplate the light of the Divine Wisdom, that light of which they are themselves an emanation.[2] In other words, they understand the creation as it is in the Divine Wisdom, and they understand it also as it is in itself, without averting their gaze from the light of the Word.

All this is signified by the Scriptures, for when God said, "Let there be light," then the light (that is the angels) became perfected. "And God saw the light" (that is the spiritual creature) "that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness" (that is the good from the bad angels). "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night."

And the evening and the morning were one day.[3]

Here we depart from the English version to follow the Latin Vulgate. Why does the Scripture say that the evening and the morning were

[1] Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXIII, Art. VI: "Ad quartum dicendum. . . . . Sic igitur instans primum in angelis intelligitur respondere operationi mentis angelicae, quae se in seipsam convertit per vespertinam cognitionem; quia in primo die commemoratur vespere, sed non mane. Et haec quidem operatio in omnibus bona fuit. Sed ab hac operatione quidam per matutinam cognitionem ad laudem Verbi sunt conversi. Quidam vero in seipsis remanentes, facti sunt nox per superbiam intumescentes, ut Augustinus dicit (Sup. *Gen. ad litt.* Lib. IV, cap. xxiv). Et sic prima operatio fuit omnibus communis: sed in secunda sunt distincti. Et illo in primo instanti omnes fuerunt boni, sed in secundo fuerunt boni a malis distincti."

[2] Augustine *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. IV, cap. xxix (*ed cit.*, Vol. V, p. 291): "Quamobrem potest aliquis fortasse mecum disputando certare, ut dicat sublimium coelorum Angelos non alternatim contueri, primo rationes creaturarum incommutabiliter in Verbi Dei incommutabili veritate, ac deinde ipsas creaturas, et tertio earum etiam in se ipsis cognitionem ad laudem referre Creatoris, sed eorum mentem mirabili facilitate haec omnia simul posse. Numquid tamen dicet, aut si quisquam dixerit audiendus est, illam coelestem in Angelorum millibus civitatem, aut non contemplari Creatoris aeternitatem, aut mutabilitatem ignorare creaturae, aut ex ejus quoque inferiore quadam cognitione laudare Creatorem? Simul hoc totum possint, simul hoc totum faciant: possunt tamen et faciunt. Simul ergo habent et diem, et vesperam, et mane."

[3] . . . . factumque est vespere et mane, *dies unus*.

"one day," whereas with regard to the other days of the creation it uses ordinal numbers, even in the Vulgate, saying: "factum est vespere et mane, *dies secundus* . . . . *dies tertius*, etc."? It is to signify the unity of the angelic nature which was the first day, that is, when the good angels are converted from their evening to their morning, they are perfected, just as the day by which they are signified is complete. As St. Isidore says:

Dies prior factus angeli sunt, quorum propter unitatem insinuandam non dies primus, sed dies dictus est unus. Qui dies, hoc est natura angelorum, quando creaturam ipsam contemplabantur, quodammodo vesperascebat; non autem permanendo in ejus creaturae contuitu, sed laudem ejus ad Deum referens, eamque melius in divina ratione conspiciens, continuo mane fiebat. Si vero permaneret, neglecto Creatore, in creaturae aspectu jam non vespera, sed nox utique fieret. . . . . Quia dum suam in se cognitionem sibi satisfacere non agnosceret, ut se plenius nosse potuisset, ad Deum esse referebat creatura, in quo dies se agnoscendo melius fieret.[1]

And St. Augustine says:

Nimirum ergo si ad istorum dierum opera Dei pertinent Angeli, ipsi sunt lux illa, quae diei nomen accepit, cujus unitas ut commendaretur, non est dictus dies primus, sed dies unus. . . . . Cum enim dixit Deus: "Fiat lux," "et facta est lux"; si recte in hac luce creatio intelligitur Angelorum, profecto facti sunt participes lucis aeternae, quod est ipsa incommutabilis Sapientia Dei.[2]

The day which is thus completed by the conversion of the angels from evening to morning knowledge has no night. It is the evening knowledge of the sinning angels that is darkened into night. This day is evening completed by morning, and both at the same time, since, as we have seen,[3] the good angels do not lose their evening knowledge (that is the knowledge of things as they are in themselves) when they are converted to morning knowledge.[4] In con-

[1] *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. viii (*ed. cit.*; Vol. VI, No. 130).

[2] *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. ix (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 17–18).

[3] Cf. above p. 115, n. 2, "Simul ergo habent et diem, et vesperam, et mane."

[4] *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. viii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 14): "Denique Scriptura cum illos dies dinumeraret ex ordine, nusquam interposuit vocabulum noctis, non enim ait alicubi: 'Facta est nox': sed, 'Facta est vespera, et factum est mane dies unus.'"

Summa Theologica, I, Qu. LVIII, Art. VI: "Et ideo post vesperam non ponitur nox, sed mane; ita quod mane sit finis praecedentis diei, et principium sequentis, inquantum angeli cognitionem praecedentis operis ad laudem Dei referunt. *Ibid.*, Art. VII: Ad secundum dicendum, quod duae operationes possunt simul esse unius potentiae, quarum una ad aliam refertur; . . . . Cognitio autem vespertina in angelis refertur ad matutinam, ut Augustinus dicit. . . . . Unde nihil prohibet utramque simul esse in angelis."

verting the good angels to morning knowledge God does not deprive them of evening knowledge.

The above-mentioned considerations may have some bearing on the frequently discussed lines of Dante (*Paradiso*, XXVII, 136–38):

> Così si fa la pelle bianca nera,
> Nel primo aspetto della bella figlia
> Di quei che apporta mane e lascia sera.

I am inclined to think that "Quei che apporta mane e lascia sera" is not the sun, as is usually supposed, but God himself. Doubtless a reference to the sun is implied. In *Convivio*, III, 12, Dante says that no material creature is more worthy than the sun to be used as a symbol for God, and he continues with a comparison, in which, by the way, the relation of the deity to the good and bad angels has its place. But in this passage of the *Paradiso* it seems to me that the sun is only referred to in order to distinguish God from it, for the sun cannot bring the morning without having first removed the evening by his departure, and brought on the night, whereas God brings to the angels an everlasting morning without depriving them of the evening, as we have seen. In fact this same distinguishing comparison is made by St. Augustine in the thirtieth chapter of the *De Genesi*, Book IV, the twenty-ninth being a single paragraph entitled: "In angelica cognitione dies, vespera et mane," which ends with the words already familiar to us: "Simul ergo habent diem, et vesperam, et mane." Then St. Augustine continues:

Neque enim verendum est, ne forte qui est idoneus jam illa sentire, ideo non putet hoc ibi posse fieri, quia in his diebus, qui solis hujus circuitu peraguntur, fieri non potest. Et hoc quidem non potest eisdem partibus terrae: universum autem mundum quis non videt, si attendere velit, et diem ubi sol est, et noctem ubi non est, et vesperam unde discedit, et mane quo accedit, simul habere? Sed nos plane in terris haec omnia simul habere non possumus: nec ideo tamen istam terrenam conditionem lucisque corporeae temporalem localemque circuitum illi patriae spiritali coaequare debemus, ubi semper est dies in contemplatione incommutabilis veritatis, semper vespera in cognitione in se ipsa creaturae, semper mane etiam ex hac cognitione in laude Creatoris. Quia non ibi abscessu lucis superioris, sed inferioris cognitionis distinctione fit vespera; nec mane tanquam nocti ignorantiae scientia matutina succedat, sed quod vespertinam etiam cognitionem in gloriam Conditoris attollat. Denique et ille nocte non nominata,

"Vespere, inquit, et mane et meridie enarrabo et annuntiabo; et exaudies vocem meam:" hic fortasse per temporum vices, sed tamen quantum puto significans quid sine temporum vicibus ageretur in patria, cui ejus peregrinatio suspirabat.

It is not in heaven as on earth: in heaven the evening does not come only when the light is departing, and the morning does not follow the night, but comes to brighten the evening ("Quia non ibi abscessu," etc.): God brings the morning to be with the evening, a thing the sun cannot do.

And so it appears to me that "Quei che apporta mane e lascia sera" means in modern Italian: "Quegli che arreca la mattina e non toglie la sera."[1] He is indeed a "sun," but a greater sun than that which rises and sets for the earth. He is the sun of the angels, as Beatrice calls him when she and Dante are in the sphere of the lesser sun.[2]

If we adopt the hypothesis that "Quei che apporta mane e lascia sera" is God, who then is "la bella figlia," the daughter of God, in the first aspect of whom the skin changes from white to black? It will be remembered that in the *Convivio* Dante calls Philosophy "figlia d'Iddio, regina di tutto";[3] "la bellissima e onestissima figlia dello Imperadore dell' universo;[4] "sposa dell'Imperadore del Cielo . . . . e non solamente sposa, ma suora e figlia dilettissima."[5] He defines philosophy as "uno amoroso uso di Sapienza"[6] because, as he explains, wisdom is its subject and love is its form.[7] It may be human, angelic, or divine according to the different capabilities of men, angels, and God, but it is "massimamente in Dio, perocchè in Lui è somma Sapienza e sommo Amore e sommo Atto, che non può essere altrove se non in quanto da Esso procede."[8] Dante's "Filosofia," then, although properly thus named by Pythagoras with special regard to human philosophy,[9] is

[1] The opposite of *apportare* is *torre*, as in *Convivio* (ed. Moore), IV, 12, ll. 39–42: "Promettono le false traditrici, se ben si guarda, di *torre* ogni sete e ogni mancanza, e *apportar* saziamento e bastanza."

[2] *Paradiso*, X, 51–53: "Ringrazia il Sol degli Angeli, ch'a questo Sensibil t'ha levato per sua grazia."

[3] *Convivio*, II, 13, ll. 71–72.

[4] *Ibid.*, II, 16, ll. 101–3.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 12, ll. 115–18.

[6] *Ibid.*, III, 12, ll. 94–95.

[7] *Ibid.*, III, 14, ll. 7–9.

[8] *Ibid.*, III, 12, ll. 95–99.

[9] *Ibid.*, III, 11, ll. 22–53.

no other than the loving wisdom of God which is called by St. Augustine: "aeterna illa et incommutabilis, quae non est facta, sed genita Sapientia,"[1] and "ipsa Dei Sapientia, quae non creata est, sed nata. . . . ."[2] Love and Wisdom are inseparable in God as elsewhere, they are as form and subject, soul and body,[3] and both together are continually represented to us as light. "Essa è candore dell' eterna Luce," says Dante quoting the Book of Wisdom,[4] "quella luce virtuosissima, Filosofia,"[5] and St. Augustine: "nata de Deo lux, est ipsa Dei Sapientia."[6] According to this hypothesis, therefore, "la bella figlia," in the lines we are discussing, is that light of eternal wisdom which was in God before the heavens were created and the angels were formed of light.

Cum enim dixit Deus: "Fiat lux, et facta est lux"; si recte in hac luce creatio intelligitur Angelorum, profecto facti sunt participes lucis aeternae, quod est ipsa incommutabilis Sapientia Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia, quem dicimus unigenitum Dei Filium; ut ea luce illuminati, qua creati: fierent lux et vocarentur dies participatione incommutabilis lucis et diei, quod est Verbum Dei, per quod et ipsi et omnia facti sunt. "Lumen quippe verum quod illuminat omnem hominem in hunc mundum venientem," hoc illuminat et omnem Angelum mundum, ut sit lux non in se ipso, sed in Deo: a quo si avertitur Angelus, fit immundus; . . . .[7]

These words of St. Augustine remind us that the angels are themselves the light that was created by the eternal light of the wisdom of God when the Word was uttered: "Let there be light."[8] And since the angels are the first creatures of God, it might reasonably be said that they are the "first aspect" of that light, the "primo aspetto della bella figlia." Indeed the distinction between that

[1] *De Civitate Dei* Lib. I, cap. xvii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 180).

[2] *De Genesi ad litteram, imperfectus lib.*, cap. v (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 124).

[3] *Conv.*, III, 14, ll. 6–10 and 15, ll. 119–20.

[4] *Ibid.*, III, 15, l. 54.

[5] *Ibid.*, IV, 1, l. 95.

[6] *De Genesi ad litteram, imperfectus lib., loc. cit.*

[7] *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. ix (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 17–18).

[8] St. Augustine insists that the word "light" is not used metaphorically for the angels, although in a sense different from the usual. *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. IV, cap. xxviii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 289). St. Thomas modifies this statement with a subtle distinction: "Si ergo accipiatur nomen luminis secundum suam primam impositionem, metaphorice in spiritualibus dicitur, ... si autem accipiatur secundum quod est in usu loquentium ad omnem manifestationem extensum, sic proprie in spiritualibus dicitur" (*Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXVII, Art. I).

first light which is the angels,[1] before which there was no light in the universe, and that eternal light of Wisdom which created it, is not easy to make, all the more since the angels are also called "Sapientia"; nevertheless it is a distinction which it is necessary to make, according to St. Augustine:

> Si autem spiritalis lux facta est, cum dixit Deus, "Fiat lux"; non illa vera Patri coaeterna intelligenda est, per quam facta sunt omnia, et quae illuminat omnem hominem; sed illa de qua dici potuit, "Prior omnium creata est Sapientia." Cum enim aeterna illa et incommutabilis, quae non est facta, sed genita Sapientia, in spiritales atque rationales creaturas, sicut in animas sanctas se transfert, ut illuminatae lucere possint, fit in eis quaedam luculentae rationis affectio, quae potest accipi facta lux, cum diceret Deus: "Fiat lux"; . . . .[2]

The word "aspetto" is used very frequently by Dante, always in one of two senses: it may mean the *view* which anyone may have of anything,[3] or it may mean the *appearance* of anyone or anything.[4] The word "primo" may also be used in one of two senses: it may mean *first* in the order of origin, or natural order (e.g., as the creation of the unformed heaven and earth preceded that of the formed, before time was);[5] or it may mean *first* in the order of succession or duration, that is *first* in order of time.

Accordingly, the expression "primo aspetto," as applied to the light of the Divine Wisdom, may have the following meanings: "Primo aspetto" *a*, 1: The *primary*, i.e., the most direct, *view* of the light of the wisdom of God—that which the angels have. *a*, 2: The *primary appearance* of the light of the wisdom of God—that which is the angels. *b*, 1: The *earliest view*[6] of the light of the

[1] "Lux illa prima," *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. xix (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 32).

[2] *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. I, cap. xvii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 180); also Lib. I, cap. viii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 202): "Conditio vero coeli prius erat in Verbo Dei secundum genitam Sapientiam; deinde facta est in creatura spiritali, hoc est, in cognitione Angelorum secundum creatam in illis sapientiam," and again in *De Genesi imperfectus liber*, cap. v (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 124): "Alia est lux de Deo nata, et alia lux quam fecit Deus: nata de Deo lux, est ipsa Dei Sapientia; facta vero lux, est quaelibet mutabilis, sive corporea sive incorporea."

[3] *Convivio*, III, 13, ll. 15–17: "Per che si vede che le infernali Intelligenze dello *aspetto* di questa bellissima sono private."

[4] *Ibid.*, 15, ll. 6–10: "Cose appariscon nello suo *aspetto*. . . . . Dice adunque lo testo, che nella *faccia* di costei appaiono cose che. . . . ."

[5] *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXVI, Art. IV.

[6] Any expression in terms of time, regarding the knowledge of the angels, must be taken metaphorically, since the angels are previous to time in the natural order. *Summa Theologica, loc. cit.*

wisdom of God—that which the angels have. *b*, 2: The *earliest appearance* of the light of the wisdom of God—that which is the angels.[1]

The two meanings of "aspetto" (*view* and *appearance*) are not always distinguishable from one another. They tend to be fused in one just as do the active and passive elements in perception and understanding. St. Thomas speaking of the understanding of angels says: "In his qui sunt sine materia, idem est intellectus et quod intelligitur; ac si diceretur, quod intellectus in actu est intellectum in actu."[2] The two meanings of "primo" (*primary* and *earliest*) are also not necessarily distinguished, and the word is often used without any such distinction, as e.g., when the angels are referred to as the *first* creatures. And so the expression "primo aspetto" may properly be used at the same time in all of the four senses that have been defined. I believe that Dante is using it in this composite general sense in the passage we are considering.

The light of the Divine Wisdom floods the Empyrean, and streams directly upon the angels who are informed by it and reflect it like mirrors—"specchi," the word used by Dante.[3] They are thus the first reflection of the light of God's wisdom, and at the same time they participate in that light so intimately that they are properly called by the same names "sapientia" and "lux." They are, in fact, the very wisdom of God in its created aspect, which is referred to in the words quoted[4] by Dante: "Ond' è scritto di Lei: 'Dal principio dinanzi dalli secoli *creata sono*'"; and in this sense Wisdom herself may be called a mirror: "Essa è candore dell' eterna Luce; specchio senza macola della maestà di Dio."[5] St. Isidore sums the matter up as follows:

Ante omnem creaturam angeli facti sunt, dum dictum est *Fiat lux;* de ipsis enim dicit Scriptura: *Prior omnium creata est sapientia.* Lux enim

[1] Speaking absolutely, the *primo aspetto* of the Divine Wisdom, both in the sense of *primary* and (metaphorically) *earliest*, *view* and *appearance*, is the view which God has of his own wisdom and the appearance of that wisdom in himself upon which he looks. But, in the passage we are considering, Beatrice is speaking as a creature to a fellow-creature, and it is obvious that the Divine Wisdom, as considered in relation to God alone, can undergo no blackening process. *Convivio*, III, 13, ll. 1–6.

[2] *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LV, Art. I.

[3] *Paradiso*, IX, 61, *et alibi.*

[4] *Convivio*, III, 14, ll. 58–59.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 15, ll. 54–55.

dicuntur participando luci aeternae. Sapientia enim dicuntur ingenitae inhaerendo Sapientiae.[1]

That light which the angels reflect, and with which they are informed, is also transmitted by them to their inferiors in the angelic hierarchy and to men on earth, "subobscure," as the Pseudo-Dionysius says, since the light, in transmission, loses in clarity.[2] This double function of theirs (the reflection and transmission of the light) corresponds to their morning and evening knowledge, which, as we have seen, they have simultaneously in one and the first day.[3] By means of this transmission men enjoy the "secondo aspetto," a secondary inferior view of the light of Divine Wisdom. "Onde nelle Intelligenze raggia la divina luce senza mezzo, nell'altre si ripercuote da queste Intelligenze prima illuminate,"[4] says Dante, and again: "discendo a mostrare come nella umana intelligenza essa secondariamente ancora venga";[5] so in the lines,

> Fin che il piacere eterno, che diretto
> Raggiava in Beatrice, dal bel viso
> Mi contentava col secondo aspetto,[6]

the poet means that he enjoyed the secondary view which is the privilege of mortals on earth. Just as in the angels is the "primo aspetto," so in men on earth is the "secondo aspetto."

But if the angelic nature may properly be said both to have and to be the "first aspect" of the light of Divine Wisdom, that name is applicable in an altogether peculiar manner to the angel who was created first of all the angels, pre-eminent over all in knowledge and

[1] *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. x (*ed. cit.*, Vol. VI, No. 135); cf. also P. Lombardi *Sententiarum* Lib. II, dist. II. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Paris, 1880, Tom. II, col. 1): "Unde illud, *Eccl.* I: 'Primo omnium creata est sapientia,' quod intelligitur de angelica natura quae in Scriptura saepe vita, sapientia et lux dicitur. Nam sapientia illa quae Deus est, creata non est."

[2] S. Dionysii Areopag. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Vol. I, *De Coel. Hierarchia*, p. 239).

[3] *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. II, cap. viii (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 202): "Neque enim sicut nos ad percipiendam sapientiam proficiebant Angeli, ut invisibilia Dei per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspicerent, qui ex quo creati sunt, ipsi Verbi aeternitate sancta et pia contemplatione perfruuntur; atque inde despicientes, secundum id quod intus vident, vel recte facta approbant, vel peccata improbant."

[4] *Convivio*, III, 14, ll. 35–37.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 13, ll. 22–24.

[6] *Paradiso*, XVIII, 16–18.

beauty. This angel is Lucifer, named from the light itself.[1] Of him says Isidore:

Ante omnem creationem mundi creati sunt angeli, et ante omnem creationem angelorum diabolus conditus est, sicut scriptum est: *Ipse est principium viarum Dei*, etc.[2]

And St. Gregory:

Prima et nobilior creatura fuit angelus qui cecidit . . . . quia nimirum cum cuncta creans ageret, hunc primum condidit, quem reliquis angelis eminentiorem fecit. Hujus primatus eminentiam conspicit propheta cum dicit: *Cedri non fuerunt altiores illo in paradiso Dei; abietes non adaequaverunt summitatem ejus; platani non fuerunt aequae frondibus illius; omne lignum paradisi Dei non est assimilatum illi et pulchritudini ejus, quoniam speciosum fecit eum in multis condensisque frondibus* (Ezech. 31:8–9). Qui namque accipi in cedris, abietibus et platanis possunt, nisi illa virtutum coelestium procerae celsitudinis agmina in aeternae laetitiae viriditate plantata? Quae quamvis excelsa sint condita, huic tamen nec praelata sunt nec aequata. Qui speciosus factus in multis condensisque frondibus esse dicitur, quia praelatum caeteris legionibus, tanta illum species pulchriorem reddidit, quanta et supposita angelorum multitudo decoravit. Ista arbor in paradiso Dei tot quasi condensas frondes habuit, quot sibi suppositas supernorum spirituum legiones attendit. Qui idcirco peccans sine venia damnatus est, quia magnus sine comparatione fuerat creatus. Hinc ei rursum per eundem prophetam dicitur: *Tu signaculum similitudinis Dei, plenus sapientia et perfectus decore, in deliciis paradisi Dei fuisti* (Ezech. 28:12, 13). Multa enim de ejus magnitudine locuturus, primo verbo cuncta complexus est. Quid namque boni non habuit, si signaculum Dei similitudinis fuit? . . . .

And he continues expounding another passage of Ezechiel in the same sense.[3]

Gregory is corroborated as follows by Petrus Lombardus:

Et in Ezechiele legitur, c. 28: Tu signaculum similitudinis. . . . . Quod Gregorius exponens ait, in illo imago Dei similis insinuatur impressa. Item in Ezechiele legitur, c. 25: Omnis lapis pretiosus operimentum ejus, id est,

[1] *Purgatorio*, XII, 25–26: ". . . . colui che fu nobil creato Più ch'altra creatura, ..." *Inferno*, XXXIV, 18: "la creatura ch'ebbe il bel sembiante."

[2] *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. x (*ed. cit.*, Tom. VI, No. 135).

[3] S. Gregorii Papae cogn. Magni *Moralium*, Lib. IV, cap. xxiii. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Tom. I, nn. 1071–73); also *Homiliarum* Lib. II, homilia xxxiv (*ed. cit.*, Tom. II, n. 1604): "*Omnis lapis pretiosus operimentum tuum: sardius, topazius, et jaspis, chrysolythus, onyx, et beryllus, sapphirus, carbunculus, et smaragdus* (Ezech. 25:13). Ecce novem dixit nomina lapidum, quia profecto novem sunt ordines angelorum. Quibus nimirum ordinibus ille primus angelus ideo ornatus et opertus exstitit, quia dum cunctis agminibus angelorum praelatus est, ex eorum comparatione clarior fuit."

omnis angelus quasi operimentum ejus erat, quia, ut dicit Gregorius, *hom.* 34 *super Isai:* In aliorum comparatione caeteris clarior fuit, unde vocatus est Lucifer, sicut testatur Isaias, c. 14: Quomodo, inquit, cecidisti, Lucifer, qui mane oriebaris?[1]

. . . .Lucifer qui fuit de collegio superiorum [angelorum] ipsis etiam dignior exstitit, qui aliis excellentiores creati fuerant.[2]

And also by St. Thomas:

Et ideo Gregorius dicit, quod ille qui peccavit fuit superior inter omnes. Et hoc videtur probabilius; quia peccatum angeli non processit ex aliqua pronitate, sed ex solo libero arbitrio. Unde magis videtur consideranda esse ratio quae sumitur a motivo ad peccandum.[3]

When God said, "Let there be light," there sprang into being myriads of beautiful forms of light varying in brightness, who almost immediately converted their gaze from themselves and the worlds below them, to the source of the light, and so became at once brighter than before. But the most dazzling of all, the very counterpart of the Wisdom of God, remained averted, unwilling to admit that so brilliant a creature as himself could have been created by another. And so did others of the glorious creatures following the evil example. And at once their brightness began to fade, and they became dark. Their evening knowledge, which they preferred, could not survive without being wedded to the morning knowledge and perpetuated in day knowledge: it darkened into night: "et vocavit Deus lucem diem, et tenebras vocavit noctem."

If, then, the expression "primo aspetto" connotes the angelic nature as first created, it specifically denotes the first angel, "first" in both the chief meanings of the word, in whom the angelic nature degenerated, in whom the white skin of the beautiful daughter of him who brings morning to the angels without removing evening became blackened.

The sin that is denounced by Beatrice in our passage which begins: "O cupidigia, che i mortali affonde" is covetousness, that general sin which includes all others, which is the common disease of the whole world, which is the same as St. Augustine's "amor

[1] P. Lombardi *Sententiarum* Lib. II, dist. vi. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Tom. II, col. 662).

[2] *Ibid.*, dist. ix. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Tom. II, col. 671).

[3] *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXIII, Art. VII.

privatus," love of self. This is the sin that caused Lucifer to fall; the sin that, in his case, is often called pride:

Merito initium omnis peccatum Scriptura definivit, dicens: "Initium omnis peccati superbia." Cui testimonio non inconvenienter aptatur etiam illud, quod Apostolus ait: "Radix omnium malorum est avaritia": si avaritiam generalem intelligamus, qua quisque appetit aliquid amplius quam oportet, propter excellentiam suam, et quendam rei amorem: cui sapienter nomen latina lingua indidit, cum appellavit privatum, quod potius a detrimento quam ab incremento dictum elucet. Omnis enim privatio minuit. Unde itaque vult eminere superbia inde in angustias egestatemque contruditur, cum ex communi ad proprium damnoso sui amore redigitur. Specialis est autem avaritia, quae usitatius appellatur amor pecuniae. Cujus nomine Apostolus per speciem genus significans, universalem avaritiam volebat intelligi dicendo: "Radix omnium malorum est avaritia." Hac enim et diabolus cecidit, qui utique non amavit pecuniam, sed propriam potestatem. Proinde perversus sui amor privat sancta societate turgidum spiritum, eumque coarctat miseria jam per iniquitatem satiari cupientem.[1]

. . . . inordinatus amor sui est causa omnis peccati. In amore autem sui includitur inordinatus appetitus boni; unusquisque enim appetit bonum ei quem amat. Unde manifestum est quod inordinatus appetitus boni est causa omnis peccati.[2]

. . . . secundum quod cupiditas importat universaliter appetitum cujuslibet boni, sic etiam superbia vitae continetur sub cupiditate.[3]

It must not be forgotten that the wisdom of God is with love. Dante, as we have seen, defines Philosophy as "uno amoroso uso della Sapienza; il quale massimamente è in Dio, ..."[4] and St. Thomas says:

Filius autem est Verbum, non qualecumque, sed spirans amorem. Unde Augustinius dicit (*De Trin.* Lib. IX, cap. x) "Verbum autem quod insinuare intendimus, cum amore notitia est." Non igitur secundum quamlibet perfectionem intellectus mittitur Filius, sed secundum talem instructionem intellectus, qua prorumpat in affectum amoris; . . . .[5]

and accordingly Dante, describing the creation of the angels, unites the light of God's wisdom with his love:

> Non per avere a sè di bene acquisto,
> Ch' esser non può, ma perchè suo splendore
> Potesse, risplendendo, dir: Sussisto;
> . . . . . .
> S'aperse in nuovi amor l'eterno amore.[6]

[1] *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. XI, cap. xv (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 530).
[2] *Summa Theologica*, Prima Secundae, Qu. LXXVII, Art. V (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 267).
[3] *Ibid., loc. cit.*
[4] *Convivio*, III, 12, ll. 94–96.
[5] *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. XLIII, Art. V.
[6] *Paradiso*, XXIX, 13–18.

In Lucifer both knowledge and love became perverted, and Lucifer is the head of the universal body of the wicked, which includes them all—fallen angels and degenerate men—just as Christ is the head of the universal body of the good—angels and men. On this consideration St. Augustine lays the foundations of his two "civitates," "civitas Dei" and "civitas diaboli":

Hi duo amores, quorum alter sanctus est, alter immundus; alter socialis, alter privatus; . . . . praecesserunt in Angelis, alter in bonis, alter in malis; et distinxerunt conditas in genere humano civitates duas, sub admirabili et ineffabili providentia Dei, cuncta quae creata sunt administrantis et ordinantis, alteram justorum, alteram iniquorum.[1]

The word "pelle" used by Dante in our passage suggests a body, and the analogy between the body of the devil and the body of God is widespread in the teachings of the early Fathers, and involves accurate distinctions, in interpreting the Scriptures, between passages which are to be understood as speaking of the head, and others which speak only of the body, while others still speak of both together.

In the *De Doctrina Christiana*, a work quoted by Dante himself in the *De Monarchia*, St. Augustine devotes eight chapters to a summary of the *Liber Regularum* of Tichonius, his contemporary, a book containing directions for interpreting the Scriptures, which the bishop of Hippo valued highly. The first rule is one for interpreting references to the body of God, which St. Augustine reports as follows:

Prima *de Domino et ejus corpore* est, in qua scientes aliquando capitis et corporis, id est, Christi et Ecclesiae unam personam nobis intimari . . . . non haesitiemus quando a capite ad corpus, vel a corpore transitur ad caput, et tamen non receditur ab una eademque persona. Una enim persona loquitur dicens: "Sicut sponso imposuit mihi mitram, et sicut sponsam ornavit me ornamento" (Isa. 61:10); et tamen quid horum duorum capiti, quid corpori, id est quid Christo, quid Ecclesiae conveniat, utique intelligendum est.[2]

From this explanation it appears that both head and body may be spoken of in the same passage, both the unity of the two and the distinction between the two being understood.

[1] *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. XI, cap. xv (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 531).

[2] *De Doctrina Christiana* Lib. III, cap. xxxi (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 37–38).

The second rule is regarding references to the mixed body of God, inasmuch as the church is composed of both faithful and hypocrites, both good and bad. The example taken from Tichonius is from the Song of Solomon (Cant. I, 5): "Fusca sum et speciosa ut tabernacula Cedar, ut pelles Salomonis," in which it is necessary to explain how the church can be both "black" and "comely."[1]

It is not likely that the words "pelles Salomonis"—"curtains of Solomon," suggested to Dante his "pelle" in our passage,[2] for another of the rules of Tichonius, the seventh, is concerned with references to the body of the devil:

Septima Tichonii regula est, eademque postrema, *de diabolo et ejus corpore.* Est enim et ipse caput impiorum, qui sunt ejus quodam modo corpus, ituri cum illo in supplicium ignis aeterni: sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae, quod est corpus ejus, futurum cum illo in regno et gloria sempiterna. Sicut ergo in prima regula, quam vocat *de Domino et ejus corpore*, vigilandum est ut intelligatur, cum de una eademque persona Scriptura loquitur, quid conveniat capiti, quid corpori; sic et in ista novissima, aliquando in diabolum dicitur, quod non in ipso, sed potius in ejus corpore possit agnosci, quod habet non solum in eis, qui manifestissime foris sunt, sed in eis etiam, qui, cum ad ipsum pertineant, tamen ad tempus miscentur Ecclesiae, ...[3]

The body of the devil is recognized and explained as a symbol for the whole sum of the wicked by others beside St. Augustine following Tichonius, for example St. Gregory:

In Evangelio Veritas dicit: *Ego sum lux mundi* (Joan., VIII, 12). sicut autem isdem Redemptor noster una persona est cum congregatione bonorum; ipse namque caput est corporis, et nos hujus capitis corpus; ita autiquus hostis una persona est cum cuncta collectione reproborum, quia ipse eis ad iniquitatem quasi caput praeeminet, illi autem dum ad persuasa deserviunt, velut subjunctum capiti corpus inhaerent. Quod ergo de hac nocte, id est antiquo hoste dicitur, dignum est ut ad corpus ejus, id est ad iniquos quosque derivetur.[4]

[1] *Ibid.*, cap. xxxii (*ed. cit.*, p. 38).

[2] A better suggestion is in Gregory's comment on *Job* XL:26: "*Nunquid implebis sagenas pelle ejus, aut gurgustium piscium capite illius.*" Subaudis, ut ego, qui intra Ecclesiam fidelium prius quasi pellem diaboli extremos atque infimos colligo, et post modum caput illius, id est prudentes mihi adversarios, subdo. *Moralium*, Lib. XXXIII, cap. xviii (*ed. cit.*, Tom II, No. 1098).

[3] *Ibid.*, cap. xxxvii, *ed. cit.*, pp. 48–49.

[4] *Moralium*, Lib. IV, cap. xi (*ed. cit.*, Tom. I, No. 112). St. Isidore also gives a summary of the rules of Tichonius, and uses the passages examined by the latter, among which is that from Isaiah (14:12): "Quomodo cecidisti de coelo, Lucifer, qui mane oriebaris?" *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. xix. It is not insignificant, I think, that, in the

If, as I believe, the expression "primo aspetto" refers specifically to Lucifer, Dante is, I think, referring to him as the head of the whole body of the wicked, and at the same time to that whole body; just as, according to Tichonius and St. Augustine, a single sentence of the Scriptures may refer both to Christ the head of the church and to the whole assemblage of the elect, which is the body of Christ. Beatrice is denouncing the ravages of sin ("cupidigia") in the whole world; and just as it is impossible for her to neglect the very source of "cupidigia," the first example of it in the world, so it is impossible for her (especially now that she and Dante are in the *Primum Mobile*, where are none but angels) to neglect the angels and speak only of men. Men and angels are inseparable in their sin; as there are only two states of the rational creatures of God, so there is only one hierarchy:

. . . . demonstretur quantum a nobis potest, quam non inconveniens neque incongrua dicatur esse hominibus Angelisque societas: ut non quatuor, duae scilicet Angelorum totidemque hominum, sed duae potius civitates, hoc est societates, merito esse dicantur; una in bonis, altera in malis, non solum Angelis, verumctiam hominibus constitutae.[1]

Quia igitur unus est Deus princeps non solum omnium angelorum, sed etiam hominum et totius creaturae; ideo non solum omnium angelorum, sed etiam totius rationalis creaturae, quae sacrorum particeps esse potest, una est hierarchia, secundum quod Augustinus dicit (*De Civitate Dei* Lib. XII, cap. i, circ. princ.) "duas esse civitates, hoc est societates, unam in angelis bonis, et hominibus, alteram in malis."[2]

If Dante had intended to refer only to the fall of Lucifer, we might expect him to have used a past tense, "così si *fe'* la pelle bianca nera," for example; but since he intends to include in his reference not only the head but also the whole "societas malorum"

Moralium of St. Gregory, the chapter before the one in which is magnified the pre-eminence of Lucifer over the other angels, contains the following comment on the passage from the Lamentations of Jeremiah: "Candidiores Nazarei ejus nive, nitidiores lacte, rubicundiores ebore antiquo, sapphiro pulchriores; denigrata est super carbones facies eorum, et non sunt cogniti in Plateis, ... (*Thren.* IV, 7, 8): *Denigrata est super carbones facies eorum.* Nigri enim post candorem fiunt, quia amissa Dei justicia cum de se praesumant, in ea etiam quae non intelligunt, peccata dilabuntur; et quia post amoris ignem ad frigus torporis veniunt, entinctis carbonibus ex comparatione praeferuntur." Lib. XXXII, cap. xxii. *Op. omn.* (*ed. cit.*, Tom. II, No. 1070).

[1] *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XII, cap. i (*ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 60).

[2] *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. CVIII, Art. I.

which is the body of the devil, he uses the present tense.[1] And if he had access to the text of Tichonius, which is by no means unlikely considering the fame of the work, he would find an example exactly fitted for his purpose, an example taken from Holy Scripture referring to the fall of Lucifer in the same comprehensive way, and using the present tense accordingly. For in the seventh rule of Tichonius "De diabolo et ejus corpore" occurs the following comment on Isaiah 14:16:

Qui viderint te mirabuntur super te et dicent: *Hic est homo qui concitat terram, commovet reges, qui ponit orbem terrae totum desertum* . . . . non enim dicent: Hic est homo qui incitavit terram, movit reges et posuit orbem totum desertum, sed *Incitat* et *Commovet* et *Ponit*. Hominem enim totum corpus dicit tam in regibus quam in populis, cuius hominis superbi partem cum Deus percutit et ad inferos deiicit dicimus: *Hic est homo qui incitat terram, commovet reges*, scilicet sanctos.[2]

The sin of covetousness which was the undoing of Lucifer corrupted the whole hierarchy from top to bottom. From the first angel to the first man the disease spread rapidly. In heaven the pestilence was quickly eliminated because there God rules his subjects directly, but on earth where there is no direct ruler (in the absence of a heavenly appointed emperor) it is still reaping its harvest.[3] For this reason Beatrice, in her speech beginning: "O cupidigia, che i mortali affonde," is speaking of covetousness among men, since the angels are now immune, but that she has not forgotten that men and angels belong to a single hierarchy, and that she is thinking also of the beginning of the whole disaster, is confirmed by the illustration she uses of the tree the blossoms of which fail to produce fruit:

Ben fiorisce negli uomini il volere:
Ma la pioggia continua converte
In bozzacchioni le susine vere.[4]

[1] It is probable that "così si *fa*" is the correct reading, since all the oldest MSS seem to have it.

[2] *Liber Regularum Tychonii* (ed. J. A. Robinson, Cambridge University Press, 1895), p. 75.

[3] *Paradiso*, XXVII, 139–41: "Tu, perchè non ti facci meraviglia, Pensa che in terra non è chi governi; Onde si svia l'umana famiglia." St. Thomas in *Summa Theologica* I, Qu. CVIII, Art. I, after declaring that properly speaking there is only one hierarchy of men and angels, continues: "Sed si consideretur principatus ex parte multitudinis ordinatae sub principe, sic unus principatus dicitur secundum quod multitudo uno et eodem modo potest gubernationem principis recipere. . . . . Et ideo oportet distingui humanam hierarchiam ab angelica."

[4] *Paradiso*, XXVII, 124–26.

For in the *Convivio* Dante uses the same illustration for the corruption of the bad angels. There he is arguing that God's foreknowledge of the fall of some could not deter him from creating the angels, and he continues:

. . . . che non sarebbe da lodare la Natura, se sapendo proprio che li fiori d'uno arbore in certa parte perdere si dovessono, non producesse in quello fiori, e per li vani abbandonasse la produzione delli fruttiferi.[1]

So in the *Paradiso* where, speaking of Lucifer, he says:

il primo superbo,
Che fu la somma d'ogni creatura,
Per non aspettar lume, cadde acerbo.[2]

The words "cadde acerbo" ("fell unripe") represent the same metaphor.

I think that the obscurity of the lines "Così si fa," etc., is caused by the fact that, in the rest of her speech, Beatrice is speaking of the blighting effect of covetousness on earth. None of the interpreters looked here for a reference to covetousness in heaven, and to some the words "nel primo aspetto" seemed to refer to the early degeneracy of the individuals on earth, which had just been described in three consecutive "terzine." Such a reference, however, would not have been accurate, for although that degeneracy is said to appear early in the youth of those affected by the blighting influence, it is nevertheless not sudden; its rapidity is not to be compared with the suddenness of the fall of the first angel, less than twenty seconds after his creation:[3] the "susine vere" are perverted into "bozzacchioni" by the steady rain, the "pioggia continua."[4] And yet the blighting influence operates early on the youth of man, and I think the word "così" does refer to this precocity: "thus early,"

[1] *Convivio*, III, 12, ll. 76–81.

[2] *Paradiso*, XIX, 46–48.

[3] *Ibid.*, XXIX, 49–51.

[4] The metaphor of *rain* is used very frequently by Dante for celestial influence. The fallen angels inhabit the air, the "aer caliginosus," whence descends the rain. Petri Lombardi *Sententiarum* Lib. II, dist. vi, and Thomas Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXIV, Art. IV. The "pioggia continua," then, may mean the temptations of the devil, but since the rain at first favors vegetation, it may mean instead the continual instruction in religious matters which is unaccompanied by discipline. How this may be is explained by Gregory in his comment on Job 38:28: *Quis est pluviae pater?* etc., where occurs the following passage: "Terra enim cum compluitur, jactata in eam semina feracius ligantur. Sed rursum si illam pluvia immoderatius irrigat, in culmo pinguedinem frumenti virtutemque mutat"—*Moralium*, Lib. XXIX, cap. xxx (*ed. cit.*, Tom. II, No. 945).

says Beatrice, "does the white skin turn black in the body of the devil," that is, in the society of the wicked, and the use of the designation "primo aspetto ecc." implies that the degenerate among mankind follow the example of the head of their body, who degenerated more rapidly than they do. Doubtless, too, the poet desired to make it clear that Beatrice is not accusing every single human being of corruption: not all youths learn to break the fasts of the church and to hate their mothers. The true members of the body of Christ are uncontaminated. It is the members of the body of the devil who are degenerate. And since he thought well to use some designation for that "societas malorum," the one he chose ("primo aspetto ecc.") was for many reasons the most appropriate, one of those reasons being that this expression designates the head as well as the body of the society of the wicked, the first and most rapid instance of prevarication. It was an opportunity to use effectively an expression such as those mentioned by Tichonius and Augustine, which indicate both the head and the body of the devil at the same time.

I anticipate that it will be said that this interpretation is not simple. All I can say in reply is that the meaning of this passage no doubt seemed simpler to the author than it does to us; that this interpretation is based not on a few stray sentences by obscure authors, but on whole bodies of doctrine in the writings of Augustine and Gregory, authorities for neglecting whom Dante blames the churchmen of his day,[1] and Aquinas, who is the poet's chief authority; that if the solution had been simple to a modern eye, it would long ago have been stated and universally accepted.[2]

That union between heaven and earth, which is contrived throughout the *Paradiso* by means of the interest that earthly affairs

[1] *Epist.* viii. 7. ll. 114–15.

[2] One of the simplest and best interpretations that have been offered is that of Parodi, according to which "la bella figlia" is the Dawn, daughter of the sun. "Così si fa nera la pelle, che si mostrava bianca al primo apparire di colei, ecc. cioè dell' Aurora. Ossia: così il cielo, di bianco ch'era al mattino, diventa nero la sera, ..." (*B.S.D.*, XI, p. 193, n. 2.) But even if we admit that the sky ("il cielo") may properly be called the skin of the Dawn (not an easy admission), the sky only turns black at night, so that the skin of the Dawn would turn black only when the Dawn herself is completely absent. Also the order of the words in the original is an obstacle, for it is difficult to believe that "Così si fa la pelle bianca nera, nel primo aspetto ecc." means the same as: Così si fa nera la pelle, bianca nel primo aspetto ecc.

have for the saints, is especially noticeable in this twenty-seventh canto, as Fedele Romani observes.[1] But the unity of the worlds is emphasized by the contrast which is continually drawn between the earth and the heavenly spheres. The subject of that contrast is "cupidigia," the sin which was banished from heaven by the ruler enthroned in the Empyrean, as soon as it made its appearance, but in which the unhappy mortals on earth are still whelmed until the time when the promised earthly ruler shall appear.

At the beginning of the canto the poet is still in the eighth heaven, and the hymn raised by the spirits of the blessed to the Holy Trinity, together with the sight of what impresses him as a "riso dell' universo," draws from him the exclamation:

> O gioia! O ineffabile allegrezza!
> O vita intera d'amore e di pace!
> *O senza brama sicura ricchezza!*[2]

Thus the central theme of "cupidigia" is introduced.

Then follows St. Peter's denunciation of covetousness in the church, the rulers of which are not true members of the body of Christ, but belong to the body of the devil. The body of God, it will be remembered, is "mixed," according to the expression of Tichonius; it is both "fusca et speciosa," "black" and "comely" in the English version of the Song of Solomon. St. Peter does not forget the celestial origin of covetousness:

> . . . . , onde il perverso,
> Che cadde di quassù, laggiù si placa;[3]

but he concludes with a prophecy of the speedy interposition of Providence, referring obscurely to the coming of the "Veltro."

The saints soar triumphantly to the Empyrean, and as Dante follows them with straining eyes, Beatrice calls upon him to gaze below at the "sito di questa aiuola," the little but central earth, upon which he is able to see the place where Ulysses made his rash voyage, and that where Europa mounted the bull, typical instances of covetousness at work on earth.

Now Dante and Beatrice are wafted up into the Primum Mobile which, as she explains, is lodged in the heaven of light and love,

[1] *Lectura Dantis*, p. 55. [2] Ll. 7–9. [3] Ll. 26–27.

and is the source of time and motion. And now begins the speech of Beatrice "O cupidigia" which, as Romani explains,[1] is the expression of the feelings aroused in her by the invective of St. Peter. But whereas the apostle has dealt only with covetousness in the church, she speaks of it as it appears in the whole body of the devil, the skin of which turns soon from black to white, just as it did even sooner in the head of that body. Like Peter she does not forget the origin of sin in the world, and like Peter she concludes with a prophecy of the coming of the "Veltro."

A minor motif in the theme of "cupidigia" is the rapidity with which it operates. In the last lines of the twenty-sixth canto Adam informs Dante that he fell from the state of innocence in six hours. Lucifer had fallen in less than twenty seconds. Among the children of men the process is slower, but still very rapid: with adolescence the blackening process is complete. The head turns black first and fastest; in the rest of the body, which is still growing—that is, in the number of the ill-predestined—the rapidity of the disease is somewhat delayed but still remarkable.

The comprehensiveness of the view of sin taken by Beatrice, which includes both its effects and its first cause, its qualities and its place in God's universe, is appropriate to her character as the Revealed Truth, which speaks sometimes clearly and sometimes obscurely, as do the Scriptures. It is characteristic too of Dante, as it was of Augustine, who always thought of evil as one of his two "civitates" which divide the whole world.

Of Augustine, Dante says, in that chapter of the *De Monarchia* in which he inveighs against the opponents of the Holy Empire, "quorum obstinata cupiditas lumen rationis extinxit, et dum ex patre diabolo sunt, Ecclesiae se filios esse dicunt":[2]

> Sunt etiam scripturae Doctorum, Augustinii et aliorum, quos a Spiritu Sancto adiutos qui dubitat, fructus eorum vel omnino non vidit, vel si vidit minime degustavit.[3]

And to those who still find it strange to suppose that Beatrice (after describing the rapid perversion of mankind) is summing up

[1] *Lectura Dantis*, p. 46.

[2] *De Monarchia*, III, 3, ll. 45–48.

[3] *Ibid.*, ll. 87–91.

that description by including in it the head with the whole body of the "impiorum multitudo," when she says:

> Così si fa la pelle bianca nera,
> Nel primo aspetto della bella figlia
> Di Quei ch'apporta mane e lascia sera,

I beg to recommend the words of Augustine already cited:

> . . . . non haesitemus quando a capite ad corpus, vel a corpore transitur ad caput, et tamen non receditur ab una eademque persona,[1]

and also the chapters not hitherto mentioned, concerning the body of the devil, in the *De Genesi ad litteram*, from one of which the following extract is taken:

> Quod ergo per Isaiam prophetam in eum dicitur: "Quomodo cecidit de coelo Lucifer mane oriens . . . ." et caetera, quae in figura regis velut Babylonis in diabolum dicta intelliguntur, plura in ejus corpus conveniunt, quod etiam de humano genere congregat: et in eos maxime qui ei per superbiam cohaerent, apostatando a mandatis Dei. . . . . Et iterum: "Sicut enim corpus unum est, et membra habet multa, omnia autem membra corporis cum sint multa, unum est corpus, ita et Christus" (I Cor. XII:12). Eo modo etiam corpus diaboli, cui caput est diabolus, id est ipsa impiorum multitudo, maximeque eorum, qui a Christo vel de Ecclesia sicut de coelo decidunt, dicitur diabolus, et in ipsum corpus figurate multa dicuntur, quae non tam capiti quam corpori membrisque conveniant. Itaque Lucifer qui mane oriebatur et cecidit, potest intelligi apostatarum genus vel a Christo, vel ab Ecclesia; quod ita convertitur ad tenebras, amissa luce, quam portabat, quemadmodum qui convertuntur ad Deum, a tenebris ad lucem transeunt, id est, qui fuerunt tenebrae lux fiunt.[2]

J. E. Shaw

Toronto, Canada

[1] *De Doctrina Christiana* Lib. III, cap. xxxi (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 37–38).

[2] *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. XI, cap. xxiv (*ed. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 540–41); cf. also *ibid.*, cap. xxv, pp. 541–42.

THE MADRID MANUSCRIPT OF THE SPANISH GRAIL FRAGMENTS. II[1]

On f. 213 follows *La vida de los sanctos padres.*

Begins: Aqui comiença el libro que fabla de la mesquindat de la condicion humanal e fue conpuesto por uno que era diacono. E en este libro se contienen de los amonestamientos e de las vidas de los sanctos padres. Ay en el veynte e tres capitulos, aunque non estan aqui todos.

Pregunto uno al abat Antonio: "Que guardare para aplazer a Dios?" Rrespondio el viejo [e] dixo: "Guarda lo que te mando. Doquier que vayas, ave sienpre a Dios delante los tus ojos."

The story just quoted is taken from *De vitis Patrum liber quintus,*[2] *sive Verba seniorum; auctore Graeco incerto, interprete Pelagio S.R.E. diacono,* Migne, LXXIII, c. 851. The Latin text (c. 855) reads:

Interrogavit quidam abbatem Antonium ..., dicens: Quid custodiens placebo Deo? Et respondens senex dixit: Quae mando tibi, custodi. Quocunque vadis, Deum semper habe prae oculis tuis: et in his quae agis, adhibe testificationem sanctarum Scripturarum; et in quocunque loco sederis, non cito movearis. Haec tria custodi, et salvus eris.

I offer here an additional specimen of the Spanish text (f. 225):

¶ Era un hermitano en las partes mas baxas de Egipto, e este era muy nonbrado, que estava señero en aquel yermo. Segund la obra de Satanas puso en coraçon a una mala mugier desonesta que fuese a el. E ella fuese e dixolo a unos mançebos: "Que me daredes, e desporne aquel hermitano?" E posieron con ella de le dar una cosa sabida. E ella salio a la tarde e vyno a la çela del hermitano, como que andava errada, e ferio a la puerta. Salio el hermitano e quando la vyo, fue turbado e dixole: "Como veniste aca?" Dezia ella como llorando: "Ando errada e llegue aqui." E el con grand piedat metiola en el ** de la çela [f. 225 v] e cerro la puerta. Mas aquella malaventurada llorava e non quedava de llorar ¶ deziendo: "Abbat, las bestias me comeran aqui." E el conturbose [e] dezia: "Donde me vyno esta yra?" E abrio la puerta e mandola entrar dentro. E començo luego el diablo de aguyjonar el su coraçon con saetas en ella. E quando el entendio

[1] See *Modern Philology,* XVIII, 147–56.

[2] The *Liber quintus* has eighteen *libelli.*

que eran aguyjones del diablo, dezia: "Las carreras del diablo tenieblas son, mas del fijo de Dios claridat e luz de vida son." E levantose e encendio la candela e enflamado dezia: "Los que fazen tales cosas van a los tormentos. E prueva a ty mismo sy podras sofrir el fuego perdurable." E pusso el debdo mas pequeño en la candela, e ardia el dedo. Mas non lo sentia por el grand encendimiento de la codicia carnal. E faziendo asy fasta la mañana encendio todos los dedos. Mas aquella malaventurada veyendo lo que el fazia uvo muy grand miedo e tornose tal como piedra. ¶ E en la mañana venieron los mançebos que la avyan enbiada al monte, e llamaron a la puerta. Dixieron: "Vyno aca ayer tarde una tal mugier?" Dixo el ermitano: "Sy, ela do duerme." E entraron e fallaronla muerta. E descobriose el manto e mostroles las manos. Dixo: "Vet que me fizo esta fija del diablo, que me fizo perder todos mis dedos!" E conto todo el fecho, como fuera. Dezia en su coraçon: "Non es de rrendir mal por mal; que asy es escripto." E fizo a Dios oracion por ella. E rresucitola Dios por su rruego, e convertiose ella e vyvyo castramientre todo el tienpo de la su vida.

The Latin text (c. 883) reads:

Solitarius quidam erat in inferioribus Aegypti, et hic erat nominatissimus, quia solus in ecclesia sedebat in deserto loco. Et ecce, juxta operationem Satanae, mulier quaedam inhonesta audiens de eo, dicebat juvenibus: Quid mihi vultis dare, et depono istum solitarium vestrum? Illi autem constituerunt ei certum quid quod darent ei. Quae egressa vespere, venit velut errans ad cellam ejus; et cum pulsaret ad cellam, egressus est ille; et videns eam turbatus est, dicens: quomodo huc advenisti? Illa autem velut plorans, dicebat: Errando huc veni. Qui cum miseratione viscerum pulsaretur, introduxit eam in atriolum cellulae suae, et ipse intravit interius in cellam suam, et clausit. Et ecce infelix illa clamavit, dicens: Abba, ferae me comedent hic. Ille autem iterum turbatus est, timens etiam judicium Dei, dicebat: Unde mihi venit ira haec? Et aperiens ostium, introduxit eam intro. Coepit autem diabolus velut sagittis stimulare cor ejus in eam. Qui cum intellexisset diaboli esse stimulos, dicebat in semetipso: Viae inimici tenebrae sunt; Filius autem Dei lux est. . . . . Surgens ergo accendit lucernam. Et cum inflammaretur desiderio, dicebat: Quoniam qui talia agunt, in tormentis vadunt. . . . . Proba ergo teipsum ex hoc, si potes sustinere ignem aeternum. Et mittebat digitum suum in lucernam. Quem cum incendisset, et arderet, non sentiebat propter nimiam flammam concupiscentiae carnalis. Et ita usque mane faciens, incendit omnes digitos. Illa autem infelix videns quod faciebat, a timore velut lapis facta est. Et venientes juvenes mane ad monachum illum, dicebant: Venit hic mulier sero? Ille autem dixit: Etiam; ecce ubi dormit. Et intrantes invenerunt eam mortuam. Et dicunt: Abba, mortua est. Tunc ille recutiens palliolum suum, quo utebatur, ostendit eis manus suas, dicens: Ecce quod mihi fecit filia ista diaboli, perdidit omnes digitos meos. Et narrans eis quod factum

fuerat, dicebat: Scriptum est, ne reddas malum pro malo. . . . . Et faciens orationem, suscitavit eam. Quae conversa, caste egit residuum tempus vitae suae.

This is a very well-known story.[1] The scholars who have discussed it most recently are probably Menéndez Pidal, *Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott*, II (1911), 261, and Wendland, *De fabellis antiquis earumque ad christianos propagatione*, 1911, 15. Wendland refers to the study by Rabbow, *Die Legende des Martinian*, Wiener Studien, XVII (1895), 253.

The *Vida de los sanctos padres* ends on f. 237^{v}:

Un onbre sancto oyo que peccara uno e lloro amargosamientre. Dixo: "Tu oy e yo cras." ** "Enpero que alguno ante ti pecco, non[2] lo judgues. Mas judga a ti por mas peccador que a otro."

This story is from *De vitis Patrum liber septimus, sive Verba seniorum auctore Graeco incerto, interprete Paschasio S.R.E. diacono*, Migne, LXXIII, c. 1025. The Latin text (c. 1039) reads:

Unus ex sanctis Patribus videns alium negligentem, flevit amare, dicens: Vae mihi, quia quomodo hodie iste peccat, sic et ego crastino. Et monebat discipulum suum, dicens: Quamvis aliquis graviter praesente te peccaverit, ne condemnes eum; sed sic apud te sit, tanquam tu plus eo pecces, quamvis ille saecularis sit, nisi forte Deum blasphemaverit, quod est haereticorum.

Beer, *Handschriftenschätze Spaniens*, notes the following Latin MSS of the *Vitae patrum:* pp. 124 Celanova—*Vitae Patrum de Graeco in Latinum translatae per Paschasium ad Martinum Presbyterum et Abbatem*—s. XIII[3]; 224 Eslonza—*Vitas Patrum*—1099; 252 San Juan de las Abadesas—1458; 361 Montes—915; 370 Oña—s. XII; 412 Ripoll—1046; 455 Silos—? ; 462 Sobrado—956; 541 Vega —950; 543 Vich—1457; 557 Viniagio—873. To these is to be added a MS formerly belonging to the Conde de Haro and now in the National Library. Paz y Mélia, *Rev. Arch. Bibl. Mus.*, I (1897), 66, gives the following description: Fol. 1.°, 1.ª col. Continentur in hoc libro adhortationes sanctorum patrum ad profectum perfectionis monachor. Tabla.—2.ª col.: Incipiunt adhortationes sanctorum

[1] Noted e.g. at least eight times in Herbert: 20, 66, 460, 468, 517, 563, 583, 656.

[2] MS. peq̄nō.

[3] This number is either the date of the MS, or the date of its presentation to some convent, etc., or the date of the catalogue from which the MS is cited. The range of these dates indicates in general the popularity of the work.

patrum. Emp. Interrogavit quidam beatum Antonium dicens: . . . .[1] Letra del siglo XIV. Vitela. [82] Hojas. . . . . Other MSS of which we have no record probably existed. It is also likely that the work was translated early into Spanish as into French, English, German, and Italian. I find, however, no trace of a Spanish translation in MS. The first printed editions of which I know are those of Zaragoza [c. 1491] (Haebler, *Zentralbl. f. Bibl.*, XXVI, 155)[2], of Salamanca, 1498 (*Cat. Salvá*, II, 824=Haebler, *Bibliografía ibérica del siglo* XV, 157, No. 336), of Sevilla, 1538 (*Cat. Ticknor*, 406: a translation into "fine old Castilian"), and of Toledo, 1553 (*Cat. Ticknor*, 172).[3]

The great histories of Spanish literature are surprisingly silent on this subject. Ticknor, though he possessed the last two copies mentioned, nowhere in his History speaks of the *Vitae patrum*. The Spanish and the German translations of Ticknor are also silent. Rios (IV, 308) in discussing the sources of [Climente Sanchez] *Libro de los Enxemplos*, among which, according to the author's own repeated statement, are *Las Vidas de los santos Padres*, misses a good chance to tell us something about the work. He lets a second opportunity pass by in VI, 45, where he deals with translations of such works as the *Legenda aurea* and the *Conlationes patrum*. Baist (414) mentions the *Vitae patrum* only in connection with Climente Sanchez. Finally, the author of the *Orígenes de la Novela* gives (I, CIII) merely as one of the sources of the *Libro de exemplos* the *Vidas y colaciones de los Santos Padres*. I am afraid that he has merged here two different works into one: *Vitae patrum* and Johannis Cassiani *Conlationes* XXIIII.[4]

[1] A French MS (*Hist. litt.*, XXXIII, 323) begins in a similar way: *Ci comencent les enhortemens des sains Peres e les perfections des moines lesquels sains Jeromes translata et mist de grec en latin. Uns hons demanda a l' abbé Antoine et dist: . . . .*

[2] The translator was Gonzalo García de Santa María. The work is attributed to Saint Hieronymus. P. Meyer, *Hist. litt.*, XXXIII, 315: On mettait fréquemment sous le nom de saint Jérôme l'ensemble des écrits variés que l'on désignait par le titre vague de *Vitae* ou *Vitas patrum*.

By the way, neither the *Caton en latin y en romance*, of which Haebler speaks on page 154 of his article, nor the *Arte de bien morir*, bound together with the *Caton* and described by Haebler, *Bibl. ibér.*, 356, was discovered by P. Fernandez. It was I who first called the attention of P. Fernandez to these works. Cf. my *Notes on two Old Spanish Versions of the Disticha Catonis*, pp. 11–12.

[3] Under Hieronymus.

[4] For Cassianus in Spain, see Beer, 615; for Catalan translations, see also Morel-Fatio, Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 90, and Schiff, *La bibliothèque du marquis de Santillane*, 160; for Portuguese translations, C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 212.

On f. 237^{v} follows *El libro de Frey Johan de Rrocacisa.*

Begins: En el nonbre de Dios. Aqui comiença el libro que conpuso Frey Juan de Rrocacisa, frayre de la orden de Sant Francisco, de las cosas maravillosas y[1] espantos que han de (venir e) acontecer[2] en los tienpos que han de [venir], el qual llamo: Buen amigo, non te partas de mi en el tienpo de la tribulacion. El comiençó del qual es este que se sygue: A vos, Frey Pedro, maestro de fisica, de la orden de Sant Francisco, yo, Frey Juan, frayre sobredicho, de la misma orden, rrequerido por vos e rrogado[3] que vos declarase e denunciase algunas cosas de los spantos e temores que han de venir çedo y en breve tienpo sobre todo el mundo, digovos e fagovos de cierto que. . . . .

Ends on f. 251: El qual tratado e cada una cosa de quanto en el es, dize e fabla homildosamente so hemienda e correpcion del sancto padre e cardenales, patriarchas e arçobispos e obispos, e[n] enxalçamiento de la sancta madre yglesia de Rroma e de la corte çelestial. Amen. Deo graçias.

The present text is a translation of Jean de la Roche-Taillée's[4] *Vade mecum in tribulatione,* written in 1356[5] and printed (only once) by Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum,* II, Londini, 1690, 496.[6]

On the early acquaintance of the Iberian Peninsula with Jean de la Roche-Taillée, I may quote from Morel-Fatio (Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 111): "Wie es scheint, beschäftigten sich die Könige Aragons im 14. und 15. Jh. hauptsächlich deshalb mit Astrologie, weil sie sich der Genauigkeit gewisser Weissagungen und Prophezeiungen vergewissern wollten, welche sog. Erleuchtete und Schwindler, wie der

[1] This form does not occur in the texts which I shall publish.

[2] MS acontesçer.

[3] MS rrogase.

[4] Thus I write the name with *L'Intermédiaire,* I, 205b. Other forms are Rochetaillade (Froissart [Kervyn de Lettenhove], Döllinger), Roche Tranchée (Ulstade-Brunet), Roquetaillade (Bayle, Chevalier, Wetzer-Welte, Buchberger). The ordinary Latin form is Rupescissa (Brown, Fabricius, Brunet, Graesse).

[5] *Vade mecum,* 497.

[6] The *Vade mecum* is preceded by the same author's *Prophetia* (494), written in 1349 and frequently printed since the beginning of the sixteenth century as a part of the *Mirabilis liber qui prophetias Reuelationesque nec non res mirandas preteritas presentes et futuras aperte demonstrat.* Together with the other Latin parts of the *Mirabilis liber,* the *Prophetia* has been translated into modern French and printed at Paris, 1831. Thus I glean from *Cat. Rothschild,* I, 119, whose compiler, however, is wrong in identifying the author of the *Prophetia* with "Jean de La Roche-Taillée ... cardinal (m. en 1437)" and crediting the latter with the authorship of *De consideratione quintae essentiae rerum.*

Franziskaner Johann von Roquetaillade, Lasa, Turmeda, Cervera u.a. veröffentlichten und in grosser Anzahl verbreiteten." A note to this statement reads: "Die Prophezeiungen von Rocatallada, Lasa und Turmeda, in katalanischer Sprache, sind in eine Hs. des 15. Jhs. der Bibliothek von Carpentras eingetragen (Lambert, l.c., I, 174).[1]

The earliest references to Jean de la Roche-Taillée in Spanish literature as also the only ones I have, are these: *Del fuerte leon suso contenido dise el Merlin, concuerda fray Juan*, Villasandino, *C. Baena*, 176, and *Çesarán muchos profetas De Merlin et Rocaçisa*, Juan Alfonso de Baena, *Antología*, II, 261.

On f. 251–282 follows *Josep Abarimatia.*

On f. 282^{v}–296 follows *Merlin.*

On f. 296^{v} follow *Los articulos e fe de los cristianos.*

Begin: Titulo de la sancta fe e crehencia de los fieles cristianos. La santa fe de los cristianos es tener e creher firmamente los quatorze[2] articulos: VII. de la divinidat e siete de la humanidat. . . . .

End on f. 298: E destos sacramentos los tres non se doblan e son: batismo, confirmacion, orden de clerigo. ¶ E los quatro se doblan: penitencia, cuerpo de Dios, extrema uncion, matrimonio.

I have not succeeded in finding anything on this text.

On f. 298^{v}–300^{v} follows *Lançarote.*

Josep Abarimatia, Merlin, and *Lançarote* will be published by me in a year or two.

K. PIETSCH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Lambert is not accessible to me. A Catalan translation of another of Jean de la Roche-Taillée's works is described by Morel-Fatio, *Cat. des mss. espagnols et des mss. portugais [de la Bibl. Nat.]*, 36 b.

[2] MS quatoreze.

OLD SPANISH *GIRGONÇA*

In the *Libro de Buen Amor*, copla 1610 (ed. Ducamin), Juan Ruiz likens the *mujeres chicas* to small precious stones, and says:

En pequena girgonça yace grand rresplandor.

Cejador, in his edition of the *Libro de Buen Amor*, has the following comment on *girgonça:* "piedra fina. Villena, Cis. 3: Asy como rubi e diamante e girgonça." The *Diccionario de Terreros* (II, 391) defines *jirgonça* as "especie de piedra contra el veneno," and also quotes Villena. Zerolo has a similar explanation.

As will be noted, the definitions given are all vague and do not give any clear idea as to the identity of the stone. In reading Marie de France, *Le Fraisne*, it occurred to me that OSp *girgonça* might be traced to the OFr *jagonce*, which Warnke translates "rubin."[1] Concerning the latter word very copious material can be found in Pannier's *Les lapidaires français*, where the following forms are found: *jagonce, jagunce, jagonces, jacinte, jacincte, jacynthe*, supposedly derived from the Latin *hyacinthus* through the Greek *ὑάκινθος*. The gender varies. Schuchardt[2] discusses the word in detail and doubts the etymology suggested by one of A. Thomas' pupils: *hyacinthus* mixed with *Zakynthus*.[3] He admits, however, the possibility of a contamination of *hyacinthus, -ia*, with OFr *jargon*, from Ital. *giargone* (compared in the *Dictionnaire Général* with OFr *jagonce, jargonce*). He traces the word from the Greek *ὑάκινθος* to the Syriac *yāquntā* (*yākundā*), and believes that the Syrians, who traded with France in Merovingian times, first brought the stone to the country. According to Schuchardt, it seems plausible that the OFr form was derived from the Syriac.

Godefroy, in addition to the forms already mentioned, has the following: *jargunces, jacunces, jagonses, gagonce*. The English word

[1] Karl Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France* (Halle, 1900), p. 59.

[2] *Zeits. für rom. Phil.*, XXVI, 398, 589, and XXVIII, 146. The following forms are quoted: MHG *îâchant, iachant*, Russ. ЯХОНТЪ, Arab. *yâqût*, Mod. Pers. *yâkand*, Old Armen. *yakunt'*, Georg. *iagunda*.

[3] Modern *Zante:* Old Greek *Zakynthos*, the island opposite the bay of Corinth; cf. also *Saguntum*, now Murviedro in Spain, said to have been founded by Greeks from Zakynthos.

jargon, or *jargoon*, is defined in Murray's *New English Dictionary* as "a translucent, colourless or smoky variety of the mineral *zircon*, a silicate of *zirconia*, found in Ceylon." Murray also refers to the Ptg. *zarcão*, Arab. *zarqûn*, from the Persian *zar-gûn* = gold-colored.

The *Lapidaire de Marbode* mentions three varieties:

L'une est granate, altre citrine,
L'altre evage,

and according to their color they have different magic properties:

Tutes confortent par vigur,
Vains pensers toilent e tristur.

The best of all is claimed to be the bright red one, called the *jagonce grenas* (also *sarde*, *jagonce granas de sarde*, *jagonce balais*). As to the various magic or protecting qualities of this stone, compare Pannier's work (pp. 79, 125, 242, 280, 292).

Professor K. Pietsch called my attention to the *Lapidario de Alfonso el Sabio*, compiled in 1250, and to Don Juan Manuel's *El libro del Cauallero et del Escudero*,[1] written about 1326. In the first, three varieties of *iargonça* are mentioned: *vermeia*, *amariella*, and *blanca*, and their magic properties are described at length. The second mentions the word in the following passage: "las preçiosas [i.e., piedras] son asi commo carbunculos et Rubis et diamantes et esmeraldas et balaxes et prasmas et çaphires et çardeñas et *girgonzas* et estopazas et aljofares et torquesas et calçadonias et cristales et otras piedras que fallan enlas animalias." The *Lapidario* also mentions *yacoth*, of which it says: "De la tercera faz del signo cancro: es la piedra que a nombre en arauigo *yacoth alaazfor* et en latin *iargonça amariella* et algunos le dixieron otrossi *safir chitrino*."

To sum up:

1. *Girgonça* (*iargonça*) belongs to the group of precious stones which are silicates of zirconia (also spelled *circonia*, *jargonia*), and are of various colors, mostly white, yellow, and red, the last variety being considered the best of all and generally called *hyacinth* or *jacinth*. The variety known as *jargon* (*jargoon*) is of yellow, green, or brown color, but never red.[2]

[1] *Romanische Forschungen*, VII, 513.

[2] Cf. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *s.v.* Meyer's *Konversations Lexikon*: "Ist farblos, selten weiss und wasserhell, meist hyazinthrot (hyazinth) oder bräunlich, auch gelb oder grün, glasglänzend. Die hyazinthroten Varietäten sind geschätzte Edelsteine; die blassgelben und farblosen, auch die künstlich durch Erhitzen entfärbten kommen als Maturadiamanten oder Jargon de Ceylan in den Handel."

2. It was probably first imported from the East, though it is also found in the alluvial sands in the Ural, in Norway, in Bohemia, in France, in Italy, in Australia, and in the United States.[1] In Pannier's work (p. 280), the country of its origin is mentioned three times:

Que on entre deus mers la trueve,
En l'isle qui a non Chorynthe[2]
La est apelée jacynte.
A coulor de ruby retrait ...
Pres d'Ethyope est cele terre
Ou on vait cele pierre querre.

3. It is the same variety of stone as the OFr *jagonce*, and has the same protective qualities. In the lay of *Le Fraisne* (ll. 127 ff.) the ring containing the stone is to protect a child from harm:

A une piece d'un suen laz
un gros anel li lie al braz.
De fin or i aveit une unce;
el chastun out une jagunce;
la verge entur esteit letree.

The *Lapidaire de Berne* says (p. 126):

En jacincte ha riche juiel,
Bien est digne d'estre en anel
Quar cil qui le porte sor soi
Pendue au col ou en son doi
Seürs puet estre, ce m'est vis,
Par la terre et par le païs:
Pestilance et corrupcion
Ne autre tribulacion
Ne li nuist por terre changier
Ne por son païs estrangier.

According to the *Lapidario*, 96 v.:

Et su uertud es atal que el que la troxiere consigo sera bien andant en mar: et en caça de bestias.

The *Dictionnaire Infernal* of J. Collin de Plancy (p. 279) says of the *hyacinthe:* "pierre précieuse que l'on pendait au cou pour se

[1] Cf. *New International Encyclopedia*, article "Zircon." The etymology given there is as follows: From Arab. *zarkûn* (cinnabar, vermilion), Pers. *zargûn* (golden, yellow, from: *zar*, Skrt. *hirânya*=gold, and *gûn*, Avestan *gaona*=color).

[2] Here possibly an allusion is made to Zante (Zakynthos), opposite the Bay of Corinth, formerly a considerable trade center for jewels.

défendre de la peste. De plus elle fortifiait le coeur, garantissait de la foudre, et augmentait les richesses et les honneurs."

4. It is *not* a "ruby," as Warnke and others translate it.[1] It will be noted that all the references quoted make a clear distinction between *jagonce, iargonça* and the ruby, which the *Lapidario* calls *robi*. The archpriest mentions ruby as evidently a different stone, in copla 1613: "*Como rroby pequenno tyene mucha bondad.*"

5. The etymology of the French and Spanish word is rather to be sought in the Greek *ὑάκινθος*, possibly through the Syrian variant *yāquntā* and contamination with *giargone*, as Schuchardt suggests, than in the Arab. *zarqûn* and Pers. *zargûn*. It seems probable that the stone became more widely known in Europe after the Crusades.

6. The OFr word being mentioned in the *Chanson de Roland* (ca. 1110) and in Marie's *Lais* (ca. 1160), it seems to be older than the Spanish *iargonça*, the earliest instance of which appears to be the *Lapidario* (1250). It would, therefore, seem plausible to assume that it passed from French into Spanish.

What color had the archpriest in mind? In another passage (copla 1387) he speaks of a shining *çafir* being found by a cock, and inasmuch as the yellow variety of *iargonça* was also called *safir chitrino* it may be that he means the same stone. From the attribute "grand rresplandor" we might infer that he means the white, diamond-like variety. Personally I am inclined to think that he means the bright red one, first, because he likens it to *mujeres chicas*, whose red cheeks and lips he likes so well, and second, because this variety was considered to be the most precious of all *girgonças*.

ALOIS RICHARD NYKL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Eugene Mason in his translation of *Le Fraisne* (*French Medieval Romances*, p. 93) uses the more nearly correct term "garnet." With regard to Arab. *yāqût* and Mod. Pers. *yāgand*, Professor Sprengling informs me that it may at times very well be ruby, red sapphire, etc. (In the *aljamiado* texts, *al-yaquta* is used to designate this variety of stone.) He believes that the Arabic word is derived from the Persian, and the latter may well be derived from the Aramaic (resp. Syriac).

THE NEW MANUSCRIPT OF *ILLE ET GALERON*

The poem of *Ille et Galeron* by Gautier d'Arras has been known only from the very defective Paris manuscript (*fonds français*, 373). In 1911, Mr. W. H. Stevenson made a report to the British Manuscripts Commission upon the manuscript treasures found at Wollaton Hall and quoted liberally from the prologue and epilogue of a new text of the poem.[1] A brief notice of this discovery was made in an obscure corner of *Romania*, in 1913 (XLII, 145). So far as I know, the only other mention of this find is in Professor Sheldon's article, "On the Date of *Ille et Galeron*," *Modern Philology*, XVII, 1919.[2] Through the kindness of Lord and Lady Middleton and Mr. Stevenson, I have been fortunate enough to secure a rotograph of the new text. A comparison of this with the Paris manuscript shows interesting and important differences. I shall here briefly indicate these differences and shall also discuss the conclusions reached by Professor Sheldon.

Mr. Stevenson states that the new manuscript is in an early thirteenth-century French hand and in the Picard dialect. A careful examination of the new text indicates that it is in the hand of at least two scribes. The past participles of the first conjugation end in *-t*, as do nouns like *gret*. The Picard features differ as between the earlier and later folios of the text and certain Anglo-Norman features have been introduced. The only indication of the history of the volume is the name "John' Bertrem, de Thorp Kilton" (County York) in a fifteenth-century hand (*fo.* 347*v*). The text is in two columns of forty-seven or forty-eight verses each. It contains illuminated initials and seven miniatures in colors.[3] Practically

[1] *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton, preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire*, Hereford, 1911, pp. 221 f.

[2] Since this was written Brandin's edition of the *Chanson d'Aspremont* ("Classiques français du moyen-âge," Vol. XIX), which is made from the Wollaton manuscript, has come to my attention.

[3] 157*r*. Lamb with banner of Cross; 158*r*. Boy Ille with dragon; 160*r*. Rogelyon in armor on horseback; 164*r*. Ille and the Roman emperor; 170*r*. Ille and Ganor; 175*v*. Ille and the emperor again; 185*r*. Ganor. It is interesting to note that neither Duke Conain nor his sister Galeron are pictured, while Ganor and her father appear twice. The illustrator, at least, was more interested in the Roman part of the romance than he was in the Breton.

all of the text is legible. A few letters are blurred here and there, but almost all can be restored with the aid of the Paris manuscript. Two words are frequently written as one. The scribe used damaged parchment in several instances, for one page which bears stitches and several with holes show the text intact, written around the damaged spots.

The poem contains 5,835 verses, 757 less than the Paris manuscript. This is the net loss, for 1,182 lines of the Paris manuscript are missing, while there are 425 new lines. Necessarily there are important differences. The losses of lines are mainly in the prologue, in Ille's earlier battles, and in the account of the courtship of Ille and Galeron. The chief additions are in the kidnaping and rescue of Ganor, and in the epilogue. There are innumerable minor changes of letter, word, or word-order, almost all of which clear up controverted points. The larger part of Foerster's notes are now obsolete. In many cases, Löseth's emendations are justified by the new text.

The rhymes are generally exact. Identical rhymes and two couplets on the same rhyme syllable are more frequent than in the Paris manuscript. There is but one lacuna, the rhyme pair to verse 1255 (after 1938, Paris) being lacking. The verse does not occur in the Paris manuscript, and it very clearly does not belong where it stands.[1]

Seventy-three lines of the old prologue are missing. The allusions to Germany are lacking and the eulogy of Beatrice is reduced in other ways.[2] Of the 13 new lines, one fills the lacuna after 117,[3] two are added to the discussion of Envy,[4] and after 131 are added the ten following:

W. 63 Molt par me torne a grant anui
Quant ainc ma dame ne conui;
65 Molt me fust encor plus soëf.
Or m'estuet sigler a plain tref
Por çals ataindre qui ains murent
Et qui ainc (*l.* ains) de moi le conurent.
Tols les premiers volrai ataindre;

[1] P(aris) 1255 "Icil i vint molt erramment."

[2] P. 8–19, 23–54, 79–102, 107–10, and 132.

[3] P. 46 "Tant come honors loe et conselle."

[4] W(ollaton) 57 "Li drois d'envie est une ardors
Qui li fait haïr les mellors."

70 Car molt a entre faire et faindre.
Servir le voel si com jo sai;
Car a s'onor voel faire .i. lai
De Galeron, etc.

These lines might well be taken into consideration in connection with any argument regarding the date of the poem. Does Gautier mean that he did not know Beatrice until after the coronation at Rome, and that he wishes to enjoy as much of the new Empress' favor as those who had known her before she had risen to her full height of fame? This would seem to favor, for the beginning of the poem, a date somewhere near August 1, 1167.

Line 72, if it is Gautier's, is very important, for in it the poem itself is referred to as a "lai." Unfortunately we cannot compare it with the famous passage (P. 929–36) criticizing *lais*, for that passage does not occur in this version. If this passage belongs in the original manuscript, it clearly does not refer to any possible source in a *lai d'Ille et de Galeron:* the *lais* which Gautier is criticizing are those of Marie de France, which were probably then enjoying great popularity in the French courts.

In the description of the first battle fought by Ille against Hoël, his traditional enemy, when Ille returns from exile in France (P. 277–546), we find many lines in changed order. While 20 new lines appear, 291 are missing, including all the plays on the numbers of knights and those where the French knights show a certain nervousness (P. 447–63). The 100 lines recounting the exploits of Bruns d'Orleans and Estout de Langres (P. 578–677) are absent, and the rôle of Hoël is greatly abbreviated.

In the episode of the battle with Rogelyon, the rejected suitor and nephew of Hoël, 62 lines are missing, while 9 are added.

In the courtship of Ille and Galeron 185 lines are dropped, 13 added. The monologues of the two lovers are entirely omitted, as is the pretty scene in which Conain drags from his sister the confession of her feelings. In this more primitive version, Conain offers Galeron to Ille, and, when the offer is accepted, goes and tells the girl to get ready at once for the wedding. We are here closer to the spirit of the *chanson de geste* than to that of the courtly epic. The faulty connection at this point indicates, however, that

at least some of the lines in the Paris manuscript belonged in the original.

The important episode in which Ille lost an eye is quite different. The 32 lines (P. 1625–56) which tell of his triumph in the tournament and his unlucky decision to try just one more tilt are missing and in their place are the six following:

W. 981 Un jor estoit en une guerre;
Si prist le segnor de la terre
Devant le castiel qu'il avoit.
Mais uns de çals que il tenoit
Al rembarer la forteresce
Retorne al pont et si s'adrece.
De la lance qu'il porte en destre
Fiert Ylle, etc.

This decided difference between the two versions suggests the possibility that Gautier himself made two versions of his poem, one for Beatrice and another for Thibaut. The absence of the tournament scene from the Wollaton manuscript recalls the opposition to this form of sport. It had been forbidden by a papal decree of 1131, renewed in 1139,[1] participants were threatened with excommunication, and ecclesiastical burial was to be denied anyone who might be killed.

The episode in which the wounded Ille slips away to a castle so as not to see his wife, and she succeeds in getting into his presence, is much improved by the insertion of the following lines after P. 1754:

1069 A bien petit que ne se tue;
D'uns dras a home s'est vestue.

In the catalogue of countries visited by Galeron in further pursuit of her elusive husband, there are some marked changes. In verse 1295 (P. 1988) Bresaliande replaces Nohuberlande; in 1297 (P. 1990) Auvergne is replaced by Norouerge and Normendie is added; in 1301 (P. 1994) Esclavonie is replaced by Bougerie; and two new lines (1306–7) after P. 1998 bring in Borgoigne.

In Ille's first battle for the Roman emperor against the Greeks there are only minor changes; 33 lines are added, 23 subtracted.

[1] Young Henry of Champagne and the king's brother Robert held a great tournament at Easter, 1149, in spite of the very vigorous efforts of St. Bernard to have the Abbé Suger, regent of France, Count Thibaut (father of Henry and our patron Thibaut), and other notables forbid it. See Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, III, 21–24.

The second battle, in which the seneschal is killed, is substantially the same in both versions. In the third battle, where Ille commands as acting seneschal, the differences are more numerous, though of little importance: 135 lines are dropped, 16 added.

After P. 3504, the following new lines add clearness to the emperor's offer:

2674 Ma fille aura a son deport
Et tolt l'empire apriés ma mort.

The next important changes are in the scene in which the messengers report their vain search for Galeron. The Wollaton manuscript omits the entire speech in which Ille laments his loss (3897–3938), as well as the 26 lines in which is related Ganor's eagerness for a speedy wedding (3956–79). In the account of the festivities on the eve of the wedding, one adds to the list of quotations attesting the popularity of the Breton *lais:*

3094 (P. 3984) Cil jogleör harpent et notent,
Viëlent et cantent et rotent
Ces lais bretons entros qu'en son.

In the scene at the church door, the Wollaton manuscript omits the 31 lines (P. 4225–55) in which Galeron expatiates upon the prayers she will offer for Ille if he will place her in a convent, and substitutes for them five of a more worldly and realistic type:

3344 "Se tos li mondes ert a moi
Ne me valroit il rien sans toi
Ne me poroie joie atendre."
Cil le voit bele et blance et tendre
Et voit le cors bien fait et gent.
Ja le baisast devant la gent (P. 4256).

In the account of Ille's second visit to Italy, several scenes are amplified. The messenger who informs him of the abduction of Ganor gives him directions as to the best means of waylaying the abductors. The attack and the rescue are described in greater detail, 60 new lines appearing. Twenty-eight additional lines by way of summary, and 28 in further description of the joy of the newly wedded pair and their court, mark the remaining important additions to the body of the poem. The 30 new lines of prologue will be mentioned in connection with Professor Sheldon's article.

In his interesting and illuminating discussion, Professor Sheldon attacks the generally accepted dating of *Ille.* He criticizes Foerster's statement that the poem must have been composed shortly after the Roman coronation, August 1, 1167, mentioned in verse 69,[1] and pleads for a later date. He considers that the critics who have given 1167 or 1168 as the date of the poem have failed to prove their point. I agree with him that the only points absolutely fixed are 1164 as the earliest date for *Eracle,* 1167 the earliest for *Ille,* 1191 the latest for *Eracle,* and 1184 the latest for *Ille;* but I do not quite follow his argument for a later date for *Ille.* He says first (p. 385) that the poet's reference in the prologue to the coronation does not preclude a much later date than 1167, as the coronation was important enough to be mentioned at any time; second, that it is doubtful if Gautier would have written his prologue, or retained it if written, while the Empress was in Italy or during the flight from Rome, because she would not have been in a receptive mood for the poet's offering then or for some years after, perhaps not till 1174, or even until after 1178. Professor Sheldon himself is not fully satisfied with the validity of this argument, for he says (p. 391):

> The tantalizing lines 9*–18*, with what may have immediately preceded them, seem to allude to something that caused an absence which led him to consider another patron, though he had not lost hope of some recognition from the Empress.[2] Did he perhaps begin his poem while the Empress was in Italy, hoping for her return before or soon after its completion, and then because this return was delayed (in which case we should naturally think of her stay of nearly four years in Italy, 1174–78), or because he had some other reason, whatever it was, did he finish with praise of the count as well as of her? Whatever had happened, it looks as if a fairly long interval elapsed between beginning and end.

This latter point of view (except for the dates 1174–78) seems to me the more nearly correct. The poet was about to compose his work in honor of the new Empress. He was determined to win as much favor as those poets who had known her longer, but, for some reason, in his epilogue he changed his dedication to another patron, Thibaut, whom he applauded as her equal. Was not this action eminently appropriate to the black days after the coronation and

[1] W. 25, "Rome le vit ja coroner."

[2] The lines are less obscure if 7* and 8* are placed before 5*, according to a suggestion made by Professor T. A. Jenkins.

the flight from Italy? If Beatrice had been in a mood for generosity, the poet would have had no reason to seek another patron. But, as Professor Sheldon himself says, there is nothing conclusive about any of this argument. There is, however, a possibility of narrowing down somewhat the question of the date. Professor Sheldon is convinced from verses 6592–1*:

W. 5805 Galters d'Arras qui s'entremist
D'Eracle ains qu'il fesist cest uevre,

that *Eracle* was written before *Ille*. I think that the definitions of the verb *s'entremetre* given in Godefroy will bear me out in my claim that the only thing proved by these lines is that Gautier began *Eracle* first. The text of *Eracle* bears the marks of having been written in three different parts, of which at least one was written after *Ille*. This opinion is strengthened by evidence in the Wollaton manuscript. The argument for the conclusion that *Ille* was finished before *Eracle* may be briefly stated as follows:

For *Eracle* there were three patrons or three phases of patronage: (1) Thibaut V of Blois, alone mentioned in the prologue; (2) Thibaut and Marie of Champagne, his sister-in-law, mentioned at the beginning of the epilogue; (3) Baudouin of Hainaut, mentioned in the epilogue as cause of the poem's completion and the person to whom it was being sent.

For *Ille* there are two patrons: (1) Beatrice of Burgundy, Empress of Germany, alone mentioned in the prologue; (2) Beatrice and Thibaut, mentioned in the epilogue, the former as the cause of the beginning of the work, the latter as the cause of its completion.

If we accepted the theory that *Eracle* was completed before *Ille*, we should be obliged to take with it not only the conclusion that Gautier broke off with Thibaut and Marie, and finished *Eracle* for Baudouin, but also that he thereupon began a work for Beatrice, deserted her, and returned to his former patron Thibaut. Is this probable? I am convinced that *Ille* must have been completed during the period when Gautier was working for the Champagne-Blois group and before he attached himself to Baudouin, consequently that *Ille*, while begun later than *Eracle*, was completed before it.

We are now confronted with the question as to whether the last patron is Baudouin IV or Baudouin V: if the former, both poems

must be placed before 1171, the year of his death. That would allow a margin of four years from 1167, the year of the coronation, when Thibaut's interest in *Ille* had not yet been sought. The closer *Eracle* is placed to the later date, the farther may *Ille* be removed from 1167, but at the extreme outside it could hardly be later than 1170. In case Baudouin V is the patron, the problem is no nearer settlement than before, 1184 for *Ille* and 1191 for *Eracle* being the limits.

Foerster preferred Baudouin IV, considering Baudouin V as too young.[1] Professor Sheldon states that this choice "is of doubtful correctness," but does not give his reasons. I hope I have shown that his whole plea for a later date for *Ille* depends upon that choice being incorrect. In my own investigation of the subject, I have preferred Baudouin V, largely for the reasons that he was known as a patron of letters, while his father was not; that he was brother-in-law of that well-known literary patron, Philip of Flanders; and that he was in decidedly close relations with the courts of Champagne, Blois, and France. But the whole matter still rests upon too slender a basis of evidence to be at all satisfactory.[2]

FREDERICK A. G. COWPER

TRINITY COLLEGE
DURHAM, N.C.

[1] *Ille und Galeron von Walter von Arras*, herausgegeben von Wendelin Foerster, Halle, 1891, pp. xv–xvi.

[2] The following errors occur in the report of the British Manuscripts Commission and were reproduced by Professor Sheldon in his paper:

Page 388, verse 3. *com*, manuscript *con. pens*, no note necessary, MS reads *pens*.

"Our poem begins on folio 158 recto, etc." It actually begins on folio 157 recto and ends on folio 187 verso.

Page 389. P. 6579 (W. 5790) *a non*. MS *anor*.

Page 390. 6* *En vie*, MS *Envie*. 18* *me*, MS $\overline{m}$ = *m'en*. 11*, 15*, and 22* MS reads $\bar{q}$ = *que*.

Page 391. 25* MS reads *liu*.

Por and never *pur* is found in the manuscript wherever unabbreviated. *M'lt* is never written out, but is found once in rhyme with *tolt*, i.e., *tout*.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

French Civilization from Its Origins to the Close of the Middle Ages. By A. L. Guérard. T. Fisher Unwin, 1920. Pp. 328.

Italian Social Customs in the Sixteenth Century and Their Influence on the Literatures of Europe. By T. F. Crane. Yale Press, 1920. Pp. xv+689.

French Classicism. By C. H. C. Wright. Harvard University Press, 1920. Pp. viii+177.

Synthetic history is in the air, and each of these three books offers the reader a summary of a cultural movement connected with France. The first and the third, as their titles show, deal with the two high points in French civilization: the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century. Both of them treat civilization as a background for literature, although it is perhaps in the nature of the case that Mr. Guérard's concern is chiefly with the background and Mr. Wright's with the literature. The second treatise deals, according to its title, not with France but with Italy. At the same time, the Italian social customs described had their origin in medieval France and attained their fruition, as Mr. Crane convincingly proves, in the age of Louis XIV (see also the same author's *La Société française au dix-septième siècle*). We need not be reminded that the French spirit is preeminently "social," and that social games or customs have a direct bearing on French literature. Ideally, then, the three volumes interlock, since the subject-matter of the second furnishes a convenient link between the French Middle Ages and French Classicism.

Of the three, Mr. Guérard's book is the most ambitious and, incidentally, also the least satisfactory. Writing under the impact of modern sociology, Mr Guérard makes a fitting distinction between civilization and culture: "The essential element in civilization is *usefulness* [the control over implements]; in culture, *consciousness* [the control over self]." The two terms necessarily overlap, but they are not coextensive. "A man enjoying without a thought the benefits of society is but a barbarian in modern clothing." On the other hand, "the sage whose needs are few, whose practical knowledge is scant, but whose mind is capable of embracing a vast purpose, is cultured in the highest sense of the term." Thus culture is the dynamics of civilization; it is the synthetic, social force, which being made conscious in a nation gives that nation unity and direction of expression. Mr. Guérard is correct in insisting on the cultural rôle of the French,

while admitting, with unusual breadth of spirit, that if we speak of a French civilization this is "nought but Western [European] civilization refracted through the French *milieu*." It is this *milieu* during the Middle Ages that he would reconstruct for us.

His treatise has two parts: Part I on the Origins (pp. 1–131) and Part II on the Middle Ages proper (pp. 133–309). The student of literature and the general reader, for whom Mr. Guérard affirms he is writing, naturally look to Part I for a treatment of such topics as the topography of France, the Celtic inhabitants of France, the Roman occupation, the Germanic invasions, and the establishment of the empire of the Franks, as all of these topics are essential to an understanding of the background upon which medieval culture rests. Not content, however, with regarding these matters as subsidiary, Mr. Guérard tends to exalt their importance and further confuses the reader by delving into the eolithic, paleolithic, and neolithic pre-history of man. Let us admit that the French are venerable, but culturally little is gained by the assertion that "the history of French civilization may be said to begin a thousand centuries ago, more or less" (p. 60). As a matter of fact, French civilization as such began when Gaul, Roman, and Teuton were sufficiently welded to constitute a new social order, and as far as we can ascertain, this was not before the ninth century. It is interesting, for example, to know that the prehistoric Crô-Magnon race, vestiges of which have been found in Dordogne, was presumably of a type similar to "a group of French peasants" at present inhabiting the same region, but the effect of such remote facts on Mr. Guérard's argument is to deprive it of concentration: the author dwells too long on preliminaries, some of them speculative in the extreme, and thus delays unnecessarily the treatment of his main subject.

The result is that the book as a whole lacks proportion; Part II, in particular, gives insufficient space to literary problems. Under the heading "Christian Culture" (p. 187), only two and a half pages are given to "Mediaeval Latin," a page and a half to "Sermons in Latin and French," and a scant five pages to the "Lives of Saints," the "Miracles of Notre Dame," and the "Drama." Or, if we look for an account of the Old French epic, we find it following an account of Villehardouin (whose work of course presupposes the epic) in a chapter upon the "Life of the Fighting Caste," of which it occupies six pages out of a total fourteen. The sole literary topic to have a chapter to itself is the "Romance of Chivalry" (p. 232), yet this chapter includes, under the separate caption of "Aristocratic Literature," Charles of Orléans (a writer of lyrics), Joinville and Froissart (who are really historians), and the briefest possible mention of *Aucassin et Nicolete* and of *Petit Jehan de Saintré*. Nowhere is there an adequate chronological record of the literary monuments emerging from their environment into the classic medieval forms of epic, romance, *lai*, *fabliau*, and allegory, to say nothing of the *rondeau*, *ballade*, and *épître*. While it is

true that Mr. Guérard's emphasis is on the social background, he is, to use his own words, "providing that background for the study of literature," and where, we may ask, is there a richer source for this purpose than in the literary documents themselves?

As for matters of detail, there is space here to mention but a random few. The Ligurians, rather than the Iberians (p. 69), it appears, were the first ascertainable inhabitants of all Gaul. On the religion of the Gauls, Mr. Guérard is wisely cautious; but it is known that originally Druidism was not Gallic but Goedelic: Lucan, *Pharsalia* I, 454, mentions the *alius orbis*, identical with the Irish *mag meld* (Plain of Delight), to which the deceased Gauls were believed to go. The Gallic divinity Sirona (p. 77) is more likely *Dīvonā*, since Ausonius speaks of her as:

Divona Celtarum lingua fons addite divis.

Most historians agree that the invading Franks were not numerous (p. 127): that they were "a mere handful" is however putting the case too strongly. Mr. Guérard might have dwelt advantageously on the extent to which the Teutons enriched the Gallo-Roman vocabulary. While granting that the Germanic *comitatus* appears the determining factor, his fairness in dealing with the origin of feudalism would have gained by adding that the word *beneficium* was taken from Roman law. The half-page (p. 163) given to the Order of Cluny is scarcely sufficient in view of the cultural importance of this order in promoting the pilgrimages to Spain (see Bédier, *Légendes*, III, 90 ff.) and thus inspiring the *chansons de geste*. With respect to the latter, it is, to say the least, misleading to speak of the *Chanson de Roland* as having "little literary charm," or to maintain (p. 231) that "classical stories and legends were retold in the prevailing form of the *Chansons de Geste*." This is partly true only of the *Alexander*, the third form of which is in twelve-syllable verse. A glance at any good handbook reveals the fact that the pseudo-classical romance, as such, is a product of *courtois*, as distinguished from Christian feudal society, and that the *Romance of Eneas* is certainly earlier than 1175 (p. 231). As for that other *courtois* product, the Arthurian romance, Geoffrey of Monmouth was not an Anglo-Norman but a Welsh cleric (p. 235); Chrétien of Troyes, not "the average sensual man with a talent for polite literature," but a story-teller of distinction, an astute psychologist, whose best pages Gaston Paris compares "aux plus célèbres monologues de nos tragédies, aux pages les plus fouillées de nos romans contemporains." Chrétien's grail is never "a vase" (p. 239) but a dish or platter; we are not certain that Robert de Boron hailed from Franche-Comté, and that he ever wrote a "trilogy" is an unsubstantiated hypothesis and not a known fact.

On the other hand, if Mr. Guérard's work lacks proportion and occasional accuracy of detail, it is well written, entertaining, and above all stimulating. The political and institutional features of the book are among its best. The

directing influence of the medieval church is ably depicted, just as it is clearly shown how with the rise of bourgeois (urban) culture the Catholic commonwealth disintegrates and the modern, nationalistic state takes its place—a change with which Mr. Guérard is not altogether pleased. "The feudal conception of property as a trust," he thinks, "is more acceptable to many progressive minds than the eighteenth-century doctrine of property as an abstract, unlimited right." It is such an admirable *échappée* as this that makes one regret doubly that Mr. Guérard's book is not more thoroughgoing.

By way of contrast, Mr. Crane's *Social Customs* is nothing if not thorough. His 689 pages take a social device—that of polite debate through question and answer—and trace it from the Old Provençal *partimen* or *joc-partit* down to the various "conversations" and *jeux de société* of the late Renaissance. As is to be expected from this veteran scholar, the method and execution of his work are alike sound, and the wealth of bibliographical detail is extraordinary. One might object that Mr. Crane takes little for granted: he tends to give us the entire *apparatus criticus* rather than the main argument capped with conclusions; Mr. Crane's style is not swift, and most readers of the volume could spare the account of the lives of Boccaccio, Leon Battista Alberti, and Marguerite d'Angoulême. By a singular slip Mr. Crane alludes to Philippe de Novaire (Novara) as "Philippe de Navarre" (p. 347 and index). Moreover, where completeness is an aim, one wonders at finding no reference to Schevill's excellent treatise on *Ovid and the Renascence in Spain*, Berkeley, 1913, especially as this work supplements Mr. Crane's researches in a number of ways.[1] Nevertheless, these are minor matters, and scholarship is once more indebted to Professor Crane for an interesting and illuminating treatise.

As is well known, *courtois* society made its first appearance in the south of France about the twelfth century. Background and climate alike, survivals of Greek culture and the Christian feudal veneration of woman in a glowing Provençal atmosphere, all this led to the establishment of the social relations which we have come to regard as "polite." The Troubadour lyric and the Old French romance are the earliest literary evidence of the fact. Without following Mr. Crane into the remoter origins, we may note that William IX, Count of Poitiers (1071–1127), is the first to mention the love debate as a social diversion:

E si·m partetz un juec d'amor
No suy tan fatz
No·n sapcha triar lo melhor
D'entre·ls malvatz.

The oldest *tenson* is of about 1137, and of this lyric form the most popular and widespread variety is the *joc-partit*. Among the numerous questions propounded in it, several persist into later literature, while the "question"

[1] See Schevill's chapter on the Ovidian tale in Italy, particularly his treatment of Boccaccio. On neo-Platonism, Crane might also have cited Arnaldo della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di Firenze*. As for Burckhardt, *Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Crane, p. 164), this work appeared in a tenth edition, in 1908.

as a type is a continuous phenomenon throughout the periods Mr. Crane discusses. A recurrent example, mentioned in Provençal, Italian, and French literatures, is: Which person should a lover choose, a maid, a wife, or a widow? or, to cite one of the oldest, Which is preferable, the love of a clerk or that of a knight (gentleman)? The latter question occurs in the early *Concilium Amoris* (*Concile de Remiremont*, end of the eleventh century), and being adjudicated there by a female cardinal sent by the god of love it naturally raises the problem of the so-called courts of love and their actual existence in the Middle Ages. Wisely, Mr. Crane here joins the ranks of the skeptics, although—again judiciously—he finds in the important treatise of Andreas Capellanus evidence that such love decisions were made only in the spirit of diversion, as an aristocratic pastime. Similarly, the Portuguese *Cancioneiro de Resende*, containing the "most extensive question in existence," whether silent sorrow (*cuydar*) or audible sighs (*sospirar*) betray the deeper pain, is clearly the toying with an idea rather than an attempt at a serious judgment actually pronounced. But it was under the blue skies of Italy that the *joc-partit* or love debate, transplanted from Provence, had its greatest elaboration. At the brilliant court of Naples, about the middle of the fourteenth century, Boccaccio received the impulse which has made his *Filocolo* and *Decameron* the repositories of "questions" and "stories" turning upon the subject of love and social conduct generally. "All the diversions," says Professor Crane, "of the most elegant society since that day are found there—music and dancing and talk—what more have we now?" And, as he might have added, these diversions were on a more aesthetic plane than now.

Of the two works mentioned, the greater attention is given to the *Filocolo;* first, because it defines the setting later developed in the *Decameron;* and second, because the thirteen questions it contains are differentiated according to the manner of earlier and later discussions. What follows the *Filocolo* is essentially an adaptation of its method to the neo-Platonism of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and to the various books on courtesy and manners in which the Renaissance is rich.

For their influence on France, the two outstanding books of this later period are: Castiglione's *Cortegiano* (begun in 1508 but not published until 1528) and Guazzo's *Civil Conversazione*, or *Polite Society* (1574). Castiglione, idealizing the courtier against the setting of the court of Urbino, supplies, by means of a debate, the elements which in the seventeenth century constituted the French *honnête homme.* This fact is perhaps amply known; but in connection with Mr. Crane's general argument it gains momentum. As for Guazzo, his treatise, which deals first with the theory and then with the practice of etiquette, was translated into French by both Chappuys and Belleforest, and further inspired Sorel's *La maison des jeux*, Mlle de Scudéry and *précieux* society in general, which was also indebted to Guazzo for the idea of the *Guirlande de Julie.*[1]

[1] Borrowed from Guazzo's *Ghirlanda della contessa Angela Bianca Beccaria* (1595).

Be it said in passing that Mr. Crane's treatment, which is chronological, lists and discusses every important treatise from Francesco da Barberino's *Del Reggimento e Costumi di Donne* to Harsdörfer's *Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele* (1641) and Campillo de Bayle's *Gustos y Disgustos del Lantiscar de Cartagena* (1689). The latest English reference is to an article on parlor games in the *Spectator*, October 2, 1712.

If from all this material we selected an illustrative example, the most significant would probably be Guazzo's reference (see Crane, p. 386) to the question whether a solitary life is superior to a life of society. For this is the problem of Molière's *Misanthrope*. The seventeenth-century custom of drawing portraits in speech and deducing maxims therefrom is virtually in Guazzo; but what makes his *Civil Conversazione* of special interest for the study of Molière is its account of the Game of Solitude. In this game various characters are called upon to give reasons for seeking the solitude of a "desert," and the first reason stated is that society contaminates the soul. The analogy with Molière's atrabilious Alceste is, of course, manifest.

Thus, the value of Mr. Crane's book is that it gives us the material with which to reconstruct the social life of the Renaissance. In spite of its great length, the treatise has the limitations of a sketch, but this is explained by the boundless nature of the subject, a field in which Mr. Crane has long been a successful explorer.

On the other hand, Mr. Wright's book is not "an encyclopaedic survey" but a restrained outline of that finished product: French classicism. Like Mr. Guérard's, it is divided into two parts, here called respectively: Part I, "The Foundations," and Part II, "The Structure." There are six chapters to each part, and the whole constitutes an admirable *Défense et Illustration* of the entire movement (political, social, and literary), nobly and simply expressed. Mr. Wright likes classicism, and he likes it according to the classical temper, with a sense of balance and distinction. When he tells us that the French incline not to totality but to "intelligibility," he is sound, and this soundness permeates his appraisal of the period. Altogether his treatise is an indispensable aid to every serious student of seventeenth-century culture and thought.

"In the seventeenth century," says Mr. Wright, "French civilization reached, in letters as in politics, a harmony of *organization*." Not that this principle affected all phases of society or any one phase inclusively, since, from the material point of view, later ages were better organized. Yet the guiding force of the age was "the harmonious interworking" of the "component elements of French social and political life." This social and political life was, of course, aristocratic or *courtois*. What distinguishes it from the medieval past is its complete transfusion with the *spirit* of antiquity.

From the Ancients the Renaissance derived two essential momenta: (1) the idea of the city as a cultural unit, "the citizen exercising his highest

function, tends towards a harmonious and well-regulated life of culture, in which all of his faculties have full play"; and (2) the realization that art and literature are the expression of beauty and vigor in a *finite* world: classicism is the life of reason; it verifies ideas by facts; it seeks the general *in* the particular; its universe is limited and controlled; it possesses no striving for the unattainable, no emotional *hinaus ins Freie*, and therefore no ethical or aesthetic disruption.

> Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all
> Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know,

says Keats, re-echoing the classical Boileau.

In treating the "foundations," Mr. Wright keeps these facts clearly in mind. His second chapter on Platonists and Aristotelians is one of his best. Had the concision of his work permitted a more historical treatment, it would have been useful to explain how Platonism furnished the inspiration, and Aristotelianism the control or form, of the French classical movement: the Pléiade and even Corneille being largely Platonic, and the *grands classiques* prevailingly Aristotelian. As it is, Mr. Wright points out that both Plato and Aristotle saw in beauty "the expression of the ideal in forms of sense" but arrived at the goal by different methods, the one by deduction from the world of ideas, the other by induction from the world of nature. In either case, however, the factor of "reason" is fundamental, since it is through reason that the Platonist reaches "true intuitions," and it is the rational faculty in man which, according to Aristotle, works out Nature's unfulfilled intentions. Thus, while there is "intuitive imagination in classicism as well as in romanticism," it is superimposed on rationalism, and classicism is primarily intellectual.

Coming to "the theories of the Pléiade" (chap. iii) Mr. Wright shows the Platonic strain in the *Défense*, especially the doctrine of assimilation and innutrition so similar to the Platonic notions of *methexis* and *anamnesis*, which Du Bellay, however, derived through Cicero, Horace, Quintilian, and, we might add, Sperone Speroni and Trissino. The Pléiade grafts numerous elements, some of which are fairly incompatible, on the parent French stock. Chief among these are Hellenism, Alexandrianism, the encyclopaedic eagerness, and Italianism, especially Petrarchism. In a footnote (p. 40) Mr. Wright says: "Ronsard saw in the poet a demi-god, Malherbe and Boileau a man." No better distinction could be made. But although the welter of Pléiade striving was considerable, Mr. Wright's fourth chapter appears somewhat to miss the native opulence of Ronsard's muse, his extraordinary virtuosity, as well as the crystalline quality of Du Bellay's best verse. While it is true also that French Renaissance tragedies "elaborate a suffering supposedly tragic or *atrox*," such a designation is scarcely fair to a type of tragedy of which *King Lear* is after all an illustration. Moreover, the last two chapters in Part I dealing mainly with the transition to the seventeenth century and the generation of 1660, are perhaps juster to the

lesser lights than to such pioneers as Montaigne, Malherbe, and Mme de Rambouillet. Amyot receives but incidental reference; Montaigne's relativism is stated, but scarcely his function in defining the province of classicism: (1) in its identification of human traits, (2) in its amateur spirit, and (3) in its acceptance of tradition as an ethical standard. Whether it is right to say of so lyrical a genius as Pascal that he was "preoccupied like Descartes with thought," is at least open to question. A reference to Pascal's *c'est sortir de l'humanité que de sortir du milieu* (*Pensées*, 378) would, if carried back to Montaigne where it originates, have given the reader a better perspective than this section of the book permits.

As for Part II, the "structure" of classicism appears in the following sections: characters and persons ("characters and types" would have been clearer), principles, and lastly *genres:* these are subdivided into the drama, other poetical forms, prose forms, and art.

A word on each of these features. Louis XIV, as the presiding character of the age, is shown in all his majesty and effulgence. Similarly, the *honnête homme*, as the dominant type, is discussed with accuracy and discrimination. Here Cléante's statement in *Tartuffe:*

> Les hommes la plupart sont étrangement faits!
> Dans le juste milieu on ne les voit jamais,

is used to advantage, although Mr. Wright is correct in quoting La Rochefoucauld's *celui qui ne se pique de rien* as the best definition of the actual type. Historically, he might have added, the urbanity of the type is related to the Italian *sprezzatura* or aloofness, a trait of which Moilère's Don Juan is an exaggeration.

As to principles, Mr. Wright justly emphasizes the Reason, since the imitation of the Ancients was justified because they conformed with it. Thus *le bon sens* is merely the practical reason, just as taste is reasoned art, and *le bel esprit*, according to Bouhours, *le bon sens qui brille.* So, too, nature is to the classicist primarily *human nature;* and if we transcend the microcosm it is "a coherent system of laws expressive of the social order and best exemplified in the life of civilized countries and their capitals." In other words, classicism holds sway *in urbe et orbe;* the two places are identified; turning to Malebranche, Mr. Wright would have found that this writer promises the devout Christian a rationalized paradise like a formal garden by Le Nôtre.

In conformity with these principles, the classicist worked out the rules of *genre;* these consisted of the drama and prose forms rather than of the lyric and the epic, although the latter was the one "ignominious failure" of the century. The steps whereby the law of verisimilitude becomes the essence of the dramatic poem are carefully traced, and its bearing on Corneille, Racine, and Molière is adequately sketched. Possibly the treatment of Corneille would have been clearer if Mr. Wright had dwelt on the distinction between the classical and preclassical periods: certainly, in dealing

with "admiration" as a dramatic emotion, he fails to note Corneille's indebtedness to Minturno, and the fact that "admiration" is a necessary feature of the romanesque (see the heroic novel) as it had been of the triumphant Italian Renaissance. Furthermore, Molière's neglect of the rules is appreciated, although it might have been stated that his treatment of character, not as passion or incident but as elemental nature, tends to exceed the classical formula. At the same time, it would be hard to find elsewhere as good an appraisal of the Abbé d'Aubignac's *Pratique du théâtre*, and of the crisis-drama of Racine. In d'Aubignac, says Mr. Wright, "verisimilitude amounts to conformity with the feelings of the spectators," and "these must not be jarred, even at the cost of historical accuracy." In this way the dramatic unities, that long incubation of Renaissance criticism, make for the sublimated universality of the classical, literary ideal. As seen in Racine, the dramatic apparatus is reduced to a minimum; "his tragedies offer us a simple but impressive plot (*peu d'incidents et peu de matière*)"; "by individual cases drawn from mythology or history are illustrated the great truths of life, as valid now in the seventeenth century, as in the days of Pyrrhus or of Nero." There is a striking analogy between such drama and a "maxim" by La Rochefoucauld, or a "thought" by Pascal. Speaking of his own *Caractères*, La Bruyère said:

> Je suis presque disposé à croire qu'il faut que mes peintures expriment bien l'homme en général, puisqu'elles ressemblent à tant de particuliers, et que chacun y croit voir ceux de sa ville ou de sa province.

Further than this, literary classicism could not go. Fittingly, Mr. Wright's book closes with an account of the "classical precepts" in the allied field of art.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Flaubert and Maupassant: A Literary Relationship. By AGNES RUTHERFORD RIDDELL. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1920. Pp. x+120.

Although the literary relationship of Flaubert and Maupassant has so long been taken as a matter of course, it seems not previously to have appealed to anyone as a subject for a doctoral dissertation. It goes without saying that the subject well deserves the careful, detailed, thoroughly painstaking study that Miss Riddell has given it.

Her dissertation is divided into six chapters.

Chapter i sums up the known facts of the personal intimacy of Flaubert and Maupassant and concludes that, since the work of the seven years of apprenticeship has not been preserved, "we must seek for the literary influence then in considerable measure . . . . in the general application by the latter, throughout his subsequent work, of the principles inculcated by the former" (p. 9).

In chapter ii the author studies the theories of Flaubert and of Maupassant regarding life. After noting many similarities in the circumstances of their lives, she wisely recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing between influence and mere correspondence (p. 12). Hence she seeks for "the more concrete instances of similarity" (*ibid.*). She finds that the critics give her little help, but they generally agree that "such influence as exists is observable chiefly in Maupassant's earlier work, before he had quite evolved his own method" (*ibid.*). Since "he was not eminently inventive . . . . in the acceptance of suggestions afterwards to be worked out in his own way, we see possibilities for influence upon him" (pp. 13–14). Moreover, "the two authors make definite statements regarding similar theories, beliefs, and likes or dislikes" (p. 14), similarities which are summed up at the end of the chapter as follows: "The environment of Flaubert and Maupassant tended to give them a pessimistic outlook, which expresses itself in their contempt for the world and for man, especially for the 'bourgeois.' Government, religion, womankind, all come under their scorn. In the midst of the general stupidity the literary man is a martyr for his cause. On the contrary, love of external nature furnishes to each the satisfaction which he does not find in man" (p. 20).

In chapter iii Miss Riddell points out in the two authors similar theories on literary procedure, but does not overlook differences, as well as similarities, in practice.

Chapter iv studies "additional literary procedures employed by both which, for the most part, they share in common with the other realists of the day" (p. 38). We may readily accept Miss Riddell's sensible conclusion that "it has not been intended . . . . to attribute to them more than the weight of cumulative testimony when taken in conjunction with other evidence presented for the relationship of Flaubert and Maupassant" (p. 62).

In chapter v the author finds many interesting similarities in "plot, incident, characterization, ideas, and wording" (p. 63). In commenting upon similarities in description of details connected with death, Miss Riddell is careful to observe: "Scrutiny, however, fails to reveal any distinctive likenesses, resemblances being confined to the universal circumstances and concomitants of this human experience" (p. 81). The author seems to us less happy in her statement that "there are scattered here and there throughout the works of Maupassant phrases which, while not corresponding definitely to any particular phrases of Flaubert's, have yet a certain Flaubertian suggestion" (p. 103). In this manner, after months of looking for similarities in Flaubert and Maupassant, one may indeed go far, but it is a dangerous and an unconvincing method which Miss Riddell herself fortunately is not much given to following. We remember that she had previously stated her intention of seeking for "the more concrete instances of similarity" (p. 12).

Chapter vi sums up the content of previous chapters and then continues to argue for the suggestive type of influence rather than for set imita-

tion. Miss Riddell says: "It seems as if the pupil, trained for years by the master, and brooding, as he must have done, both during that period and in subsequent days of remembrance, over the monuments of that master's achievement, had absorbed so thoroughly the essentials of the latter's thought and expression that he reproduced them almost unconsciously" (pp. 109–10). This is a sane and balanced judgment which does the author credit.[1] Miss Riddell further shows that she has not lost her balance when she says: "It goes without saying that a considerable portion of Maupassant's work is, of course, distinctively his own" (p. 110). She calls attention also to the influence of "their day and generation" upon both, to the possible influence of Balzac, Zola, Daudet, and to "other writers" who are, unfortunately, not named. Here Professor Olin H. Moore might be of help with his article on "The Literary Relationships of Guy de Maupassant," published before Miss Riddell's thesis, though written later.[2] Miss Riddell's final conclusion is that "when all allowances have been made, however, it yet remains true that Maupassant is the disciple of Flaubert and owes to that master's influence much that is best in his own work" (p. 110).

Miss Riddell's conclusions are moderate and sane. It is perhaps rather surprising that, after mentioning that Maupassant's later work was less influenced by Flaubert, she does not return to develop the idea in detail. Should not just such a study as hers furnish the evidence needed, if considered chronologically, to determine the truth or falsity of the generally accepted opinion? It might be worth noting also that the very "unbookishness" of Maupassant would seem to make him especially susceptible to the word-of-mouth teaching of his friend.[3] Maupassant himself tells us that from Bouilhet and Flaubert he got persistency in literary effort, "la force de toujours tenter."[4] Finally, Miss Riddell's study serves to show that Flaubert's influence helped Maupassant to learn, not merely *how* to write, but even in many cases *what* to write, since from the former came many characters and episodes as well as opinions and methods of literary procedure.

Some one, perhaps Miss Riddell herself, should now be able to tell us with greater precision than before just how great is the *originality* of Maupassant, the degree to which his genius is distinctive, for that it is distinctive we can still hardly doubt.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

[1] On this same page occurs a repetition of the argument criticized in our discussion of chap. v, p. 103. The same criticism would apply here, but the argument seems not to have led the author seriously astray.

[2] *Modern Philology*, XV (1918), 645–62.

[3] Of course not all of Flaubert's teaching was by word of mouth.

[4] Maupassant, *Le Roman* (Pierre et Jean), p. 20.

El Diablo Cojuelo, Luis Vélez de Guevara. Edición y Notas de FRANCISCO RODRÍGUEZ Y MARÍN. Madrid: Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1918.

In this new and "popular" edition of *El Diablo Cojuelo*, Rodríguez Marín has again demonstrated his extensive knowledge of Spanish tradition, folklore, and *refranes*. With few exceptions, all the difficult passages have been explained in copious notes, to which more detailed reference will be made later.

As compared with Bonilla y San Martín's last edition (1910), we may note some improvements and some new material. In the *prólogo* Rodríguez Marín has revised the biography of Guevara in the light of recent discoveries. Much of what has hitherto been accepted, the letter of Guevara's son in particular, is shown to be false. There is also a brief review of Guevara's *teatro* and an appreciation of Vélez by his contemporaries. Some of the material is new, but a part is accredited to Cotarelo y Mori's more extensive article along the same line. (See the *Boletín de la Real Academia*, December, 1916, and April, 1917.)

The most interesting feature of the *prólogo*, however, is the compilation of a large number of references to the *diablo cojuelo:* we are made acquainted with the *diablo* as he was known in popular song, folklore, and tradition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In keeping with the expressed hope of placing *El Diablo Cojuelo* within the reach of the public, Rodríguez Marín has modernized the spelling. This would hardly be tolerated in any other kind of edition. In a few cases the punctuation has been changed; the change always betters the reading of the passage.

The chief value of the present edition lies in the notes. It is true that Pérez y Gonzalez and Bonilla y San Martín had, in their previous editions, discovered most of the difficulties and explained many of them, but this does not detract from the value of Rodrìguez Marín's work. All of the notes are re-written, and a large part of the material is new; they contain a wealth of detailed description that cannot be found elsewhere. A few of the best may be cited: *Rentoy*, p. 68, l. 6; *plazuela de Herradores*, 70, 4; *don extravagante*, 72, 19; *pastel de a cuarto*, 78, 7; note on poets in general, 102, 8; *rollo de Ecija*, 157, 7. The historical notes on pp. 107 and 109 contain material which would probably be inaccessible to one outside of Spain. The notes on *echar las habas* (p. 209) and on *andar el cedazo* contain the most detailed description of such practices that I have ever seen. The note on page 251, line 14, clears up an obscure reference: the same is true of the note on *carril de pozo*, page 258, line 13. Rodríguez Marín frequently takes issue with Bonilla y San Martín. He is not always successful, as will be

seen by comparing their notes on *boquita de riñon* (Rodríguez Marín, p. 66, l. 16; Bonilla y San Martín, p. 245).

In addition to the copious notes Rodríguez Marín has pointed out a number of *refranes* and *frases populares* which Guevara had ingeniously re-worked to suit his own purpose, thereby disguising them for the average reader. For example, page 28, line 15, *que camino del infierno, tanto anda el cojo como el viento* for *camino de Santiago*, etc.; 45, 15, *Aca estamos todos;* 48, 8, *y como ha cobrado buena fama, se ha echado a dormir*, for *cobra buena fama y echate a dormir;* 53, 1, *y trecientas cosas mas; porque al fin de años mil, vuelven los nombres por donde solian ir*, instead of *al fin de años mil, vuelven las aguas por donde solian ir.*

Another commendable feature of the present edition is the setting off of the verse in its proper form: pages 84, 118, 133, 157 (here Bonilla also), 200.[1]

While on two occasions Rodríguez Marín frankly admits that he is unable to explain certain passages (pp. 52, l. 14; 90, 1), it will be seen that this edition leaves little or nothing to be desired in the way of notes: there are, however, many things lacking to make it a complete edition. In the *prólogo* Rodríguez Marín avoids a discussion of the date of composition; he also fails to mention Le Sage's *Le Diable Boiteux.* Nor does he discuss *El Diablo Cojuelo.* As yet this novel has not been assigned to any definite category: it certainly cannot be classified as a picaresque novel, nor can it be called a *novela de costumbres.* It partakes of the nature of both, and these two parts are distinct. Through *tranco* IV, with the exception of one picaresque adventure, we have a series of *cuadros de costumbres.* Part two, beginning with *tranco* V, is almost entirely picaresque. No explanation of the long list of nobles in *tranco* VIII is made. It is evident of course that many of them were mentioned merely because they were at court, but it is also certain that Vélez had closer connection with some of them. This is a piece of work that must be done in Spain.

The sources of the *Diablo Cojuelo* are but lightly touched upon. There is, first, the Lucianesque influence to which Guevara himself calls attention in the first *tranco:* the dialogue which he had in mind is *Icaro-Menippus.* In this dialogue Menippus relates how he had been able to fashion wings and take flight to the ethereal regions. While resting on the moon he was able to see all that passed on the earth. Still another of the dialogues, *The Dream*, is promising as source material. Simyllus is acquainted with the charm in the long feather of a cock's tail. Armed with this he opens the doors of his neighbors' houses and, invisible, sees all that is passing within. Other passages which have a Lucianesque flavor are page 49, lines 12–13, and *tranco* VI, where Don Cleofas and the *cojuelo* are resting under the stars. Don Cleofas asks his companion to relate what he saw during his fall from

[1] The following typographical errors are to be noted: the reference to note 205, l. 23, should be 205, 13; 205, 26, should be 205, 17.

heaven. The same question is asked of Menippus, and the answer is substantially the same as the one given by the *cojuelo*.

Quevedo's influence is far greater. Generally, it may be said that there are few characters satirized in *El Diablo Cojuelo* for which a parallel may not be found in either the *Sueños* of Quevedo or in some of his verses.

A careful analysis will show that the theme of the first four *trancos* of *El Diablo Cojuelo* is similar to that of Quevedo's *El Mundo por de Dentro*. This *Sueño* is the only one which has a continuous thread: the same characters continue throughout. Quevedo is guided along the *Calle Mayor* of the world, which is Hypocrisy. This is exactly what happens to Don Cleofas in *El Diablo Cojuelo*, where we have a more detailed description of this same street. The *calle de gestos*, *casa de locos*, *pila de dones*, and ancestral wardrobe described by Guevara are but the fruit of hypocrisy. Rodríguez Marín has pointed out (p. 229, l. 1) that the funeral described by Guevara in *tranco* VIII is similar to that described by Quevedo in *El Mundo por de Dentro*. The following are a few of the many passages in *El Diablo Cojuelo* which may have been suggested by Quevedo. The escape of the *cojuelo* from the flask recalls a passage in *Zahurdas de Pluton* (*Biblioteca de Autores españoles*, 310*b*). The opening lines of *tranco* II, *Quedo don Cleofas absorto en aquella pepitoria humana, de tanta diversidad de manos, pies y cabezas*, recall Quevedo's description of Madrid:

> Dè ese famoso lugar,
> Que es pepitoria del mundo,
> En donde pies y cabezas
> Todo esta revuelto y junto [*B.A.E.*, t. lxix, pág., 209*b*]

Again, in *tranco* VII, Guevara's description of Fortuna and her train is undoubtedly inspired by Quevedo's Romance upon the same subject (*B.A.E.*, t. lxix, pág. 204*b*). Guevara's *premáticas*, in *tranco* X, are similar to those which Quevedo gives in *El Buscón*, chapter x. The *cojuelo*'s account of his visit to Constantinople and his return through Italy, touching in Venice, Naples, Genoa, Florence, and parts of Germany, is but a concise paraphrase of Quevedo's treatment of the conditions in these cities. See *La Hora de Todos*, etc., Nos. 35, 33, 32, 34. The order is the same, though inverse, for the *cojuelo* made his visits while returning to Spain.

Finally, I would suggest the following as an addition to the note on the *cuba de Sahagun:* Lopez de Ubeda in *La Pícara Justina* (1605) tells us that this well-known and most ancient vat was located at Sahagun, a town in the province of Leon, famous for a Benedictine monastery dating back to the ninth century and restored in the eleventh. Hence Guevara's allusion "y no profeso." The name Sahagun is in reality derived from San Facundo.

E. R. SIMS

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

A Short Italian Dictionary. By ALFRED HOARE. Cambridge: The University Press; and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Vol. I, Italian-English, 1918, pp. xxviii+443. Vol. II, English-Italian, 1919, pp. vi+294.

Mr. Hoare's large and costly *Italian Dictionary* was reviewed in *Modern Philology*, XIV, 429–30. Its use as a reference work for some three years has yielded abundant proof of its thoroughness, its accuracy, and its general excellence.

The need of a cheaper edition has now been met; the dictionary thus becomes much more accessible to teachers and to students.

The first volume is an abridgment of the Italian-English part of the quarto edition; but the loss of material is not so large as one might expect. Some forty thousand words are treated, as against some fifty thousand in the original edition. Space is saved by the omission of the words least important from the point of view of the average user of the dictionary, by the shortening of definitions, by the omission of etymologies, and by the plan of grouping within a single paragraph words built upon a single unvarying stem.

The introductory pages on the conjugation of Italian verbs constitute an unnecessary duplication of material available in ordinary Italian grammars, and are open to adverse criticism in several points of detail.

The second volume is an expansion of the English-Italian part of the quarto edition. It contains some thirty thousand words—five thousand or so more than the earlier form. It is then the most comprehensive as well as the best English-Italian dictionary in existence. Its value would have been increased had the diacritic indications of pronunciation been used for all Italian words instead of being limited to proper nouns and adjectives.

This volume, like the other, is laudably generous in the treatment of idiomatic phrases. Here one may learn how to say in Italian, "The Daily Mail has a *circulation* of . . . . copies," or "Tips are often quite a serious *item* in a young man's expenditures," or "Cambridge won the *toss* and chose the Surrey side"; or that to *catch out* is "Al giuoco di cricket, prender una palla fatta salire in aria dal batsman prima che cada in terra, terminando così l'innings di questo." But *baseball* is only "un certo giuoco americano."

ERNEST H. WILKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Classical Technology. Edited from Codex Lucensis 490 by JOHN M. BURNHAM, Professor of Latin, University of Cincinnati. Boston: Richard S. Badger, the Gorham Press, 1920.

The *Classical Technology* is a collection of recipes for making colors, inks, varnishes, and compounds of various sorts. It is the second work by our author in this field, the first, *Recipes from Codex Matritensis A 16*,

having appeared in the "University of Cincinnati Studies" in 1912. These recipes, according to Professor Burnham, originated in Alexandria about 300 A.D. They were brought to Italy and translated into Low Latin about 650 or possibly earlier. The Lucca MS was written at the close of the eighth century in various scripts (among them apparently the Visigothic). The scribe of the pages containing the recipes must have been an Italian. The immediate archetype of the Lucensis was Spanish; this is proved by various paleographical symptoms as well as by certain linguistic peculiarities in the text. Burnham assumes the year 725 as the approximate date of this Spanish MS.

The editor prints an exact transcript of the text, preserving the spelling, punctuation, word-separation (or lack of it) of the MS; only the abbreviations are expanded. In a brief commentary (pp. 77–180) some special points are discussed. A translation of the text follows (pp. 81–188); this must have given the editor as much trouble as the constitution of the text: bad Latin on bad Greek does not make for clearness. A Glossary (pp. 138–166) contains a list of new or rare words or meanings and unusual constructions. The editor notes about ninety words not found in our dictionaries and about forty words that are starred in the Romance dictionaries of Körting and Meyer-Lübke. Pages 166–70 are devoted to a discussion of the lexicography and syntax of the translation.

Both Latinists and Romance scholars should be grateful to Professor Burnham for this excellent work. It was especially desirable that a difficult MS like the Lucensis be edited by a trained paleographer.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII *April 1921* NUMBER 12

THE EPILOG OF CHAUCER'S *TROILUS*

The last twelve stanzas of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* owe little to the main source of the poem, and form a diffused Epilog or *envoi*, mingled with the completion of the story. This alternation impresses one as due, not to a series of afterthoughts, but rather to a spontaneity of style, a lingering unwillingness to make an end of the work which he had written with such strong interest, or an artful heed to emotional effect.[1] For a combination of grandeur and charm the ending is seldom matched in poetry. (1) "Go little book," he says in adieu, and exhorts his work to do homage to its poetic masters (V, ll. 1786–92). (2) He prays that its text and verse be not corrupted (ll. 1793–99). (3) He narrates Troilus' death and ascent to heaven (ll. 1800–34). (4) He exhorts the young to turn their hearts from worldly vanities to love of God, and contrasts Christian truth with pagan illusions (ll. 1835–55; cf. l. 1825). (5) He directs his book to Gower and Strode, and asks for their corrections (ll. 1856–59). (6) He ends in an imposing and devotional invocation to the Trinity (ll. 1860–69).

The second of these parts expresses the misgiving of the careful workman when his fancy darts ahead and pictures the obliteration of finer touches by heedless scribes and ignorant readers; one of the

[1] The preceding two stanzas as well, on Criseyde's and others' treason to love, are general in application, and might be called part of the Epilog, and help account for its curious arrangement. In them he draws a worldly conclusion; then after dismissing his book and rounding off the story, he ends in a loftier vein. He did not wish to pass directly from a prudential caution against rakes to a devout transcending of all earthly love. See note on p. 626.

earliest expressions in English of the self-consciousness of literary art.[1] The third is based partly on the ending of Boccaccio's *Filostrato*, the main source of the whole poem, but (as is well known) chiefly on his *Teseide*, XI, 1–3.[2] In the sixth and last, Chaucer holds to the frequent medieval practice, which Boccaccio abandoned,

[1] This is the earliest time in his works that Chaucer expresses this solicitude. That his fears were often enough realized we see in the *Words to Adam;* also in *K.T.*, 2062–64 (compared with *T.C.*, III, 726), and *Pard. T.*, 585. Cf. the writer's *Scene of the Frankl. T. Visited* (Chaucer Soc., 1914, p. 36). His fear of miswriting and of mismetering for default of tongue he says is due to the great diversity in English and in the writing of it. He is probably thinking both of general dialectical differences, and of the increasingly recessive accent in French dissyllables and especially the growing disregard of the final *–e*, which had begun in the north and was becoming so common in his day that soon after his death his usage was hardly understood. This misunderstanding accounts for Dryden's patronizing manner in speaking of Chaucer's verse in the Preface to the *Fables*. Perhaps there is an indication in the passage that Chaucer admits what the modern student recognizes, his somewhat arbitrary practice as to the pronunciation of final *–e*. Cf. note on p. 641 below for another possible reason for the passage, especially ll. 1797–98. The fact is now generally recognized that Chaucer had it in mind that the poem was to be read aloud by himself and others; cf. I, 32–33, 450; II, 30, 917; III, 495, 499, 1330 ff.; IV, 799–803; V, 1032, 1796–97. In V, 270, however, he addresses the "redere." His constant pretense in *T.C.* (I, 15 ff., 436; II, 19–21; III, 1319–20, 1333) and elsewhere (*H.F.*, 248, 628, 667–68; *L.G.W.*, 1167; *P.F.*, 8–11, etc.), of personal inexperience in love may be meant to avert chaff from himself in a circle of friends to whom he was reading. He not only omits but deliberately reverses Boccaccio's personal love confession, as is noted by Professor Kittredge ("Chaucer's Lollius," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXVIII, 66–67). Various requests more or less like Chaucer's may be recalled elsewhere, such as Orm's instructions for careful copying in the dedication of his alleged poem. Professor C. G. Allen has shown me a particularly curious parallel in the "Prólogo general que á sus obras puso Don Juan Manuel" in the early fourteenth century; see *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, LI (Madrid, 1860), 233–34. Don Juan laments the errors of copyists, states that he has collected his works hitherto written into one standard copy (cf. Alfred's Preface to the *Cura Pastoralis*), and asks readers not to blame him for anything before they have consulted this:

Et recelando yo, don Johan, que por razon que non se podrá excusar que los libros que yo he fechos non se hayan de trasladar muchas veces, et porque yo he visto que en los traslados acaesce muchas veces, lo uno por desentendimiento de escribano, ó porque las letras semejan unas á otras, que en trasladando el libro ponen una razon por otra, en guisa que muda toda la entencion et toda la suma, et sea traido el que la fizo, non habiendo y[o] culpa; et por guardar esto cuanto yo pudiere, fice facer este volúmen en que están escriptos todos los libros que yo fasta aquí he fechos. . . . . Et ruego á todos los que leyeren cualquier de los libros que yo fiz, que, si fallaren alguna razon mal dicha, que non pongan á mí la culpa fasta que vean este volúmen que yo mesmo concerté.

At the end of St. Anselm's Preface to his *Monologion* he requests the copyist to be sure to put the Preface first, that what follows may be better understood. At the end of the Old Irish *Táin bó Cúalgne* (ed. by Windisch, p. 911) blessings are invoked on those who leave the text unaltered. The most venerable instance is the warning against addition or diminution in the Book of Revelations (xxii, 18, 19).

[2] The passage from the *Teseide*, lacking in some MSS, was put in by Chaucer after the poem had been a while in circulation. So he increased the broken effect of the ending by adding this bit of narrative, without which it would have been an almost purely lyrical *envoi*. But he did so with good reason. Some have thought the account of Troilus' flight to heaven frigid, especially after the warmth of the rest of the poem. But its otherworldly tone is meant to lead into the unworldly ending which follows; piety with a pagan touch forms a transition from pagan worldliness to Christian devoutness. It was probably to avoid too abrupt a shift from sympathy to detachment that the four stanzas intervene between the last preceding mention of Troilus, and the account of his death and the slurs on worldly love. Compare my first note. Professor R. K. Root (*Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus*, Ch. Soc., 1916, pp. 245–48) shows no other considerable variant hereabout except in ll. 1866–67 ("Trine vnite vs from oure cruel foone Defende," in MSS Harl. 3943 and Rawl.). This whole passage in the *Teseide* seems not to have been recognized as a reminiscence of the *Paradiso*, XXII, 100–154, where Dante rises from the seventh to the eighth sphere, views the planets circling beneath him, and smiles at the vile semblance of our earth.

of a religious ending.[1] But Chaucer is in no sense following a mere convention, and there was a special reason for the thing here (on which more hereafter). The purpose of the present article is to consider what usage he was following, or what he had in mind, in the first, fourth, and fifth parts.

The "Go little book" *envoi* has had a long history. Like so much else, it can be traced to Ovid. For years long Ovid had been chafing against his lot at Tomi; such interest as there may have been in a frontier town, like a modern Manchurian frontier town, did not appeal in the least to an elderly man used to metropolitan society. Many a day he saw the courier start toward gelid Thrace, cloud-covered Haemus and the waters of the Ionian Sea with dispatches for The City (*Ex Ponto* iv. 5). Now and again he would send by the courier to Rome some Ballad of Reading Gaol, and would address the lucky "Little Book" without grudging its good fortune but not without bitter envy:

> Parve—nec invideo—sine me, liber, ibis in urbem:
> Ei mihi, quod domino non licet ire tuo!
> Vade, sed incultus, qualem decet exulis esse.
> . . . . . .
> Vade, liber, verbisque meis loca grata saluta.
> . . . . . .
> I tamen et pro me tu, cui licet, aspice Romam!
> [*Tristia* i. 1. 1–3, 15, 57].
>
> Vade salutatum, subito perarata, Perillam,
> Littera, sermonis fida ministra mei! [iii. 7].
>
> Ite, leves elegi, doctas ad consulis aures,
> Verbaque honorato ferte legenda viro
> [*Ex Ponto* iv. 5].[2]

[1] Ll. 1863–65 were shown by Cary to be borrowed from *Paradiso*, XIV, 28–30. Cf. also *Purgatorio*, XI, 2; Boccaccio's *Filostrato*, II, 41, and his *De Gen. Deorum*, XV, 9 ([eighth ed.; Basle, 1532], p. 394, God *omnia intra se continentem, et a nullo contentum*). On the origin of the Dante passages see the writer's article in *Romanic Review*, X, 274 ff. A religious ending is especially common in earlier and less sophisticated works and those adapted to oral delivery. Therefore it seems commoner in English than in French. It was revived in the sophisticated and unspontaneous English literature of the fifteenth century. Most of the *Canterbury Tales* have some sort of pious ending, which carries out their oral and generally popular character. Without a special reason for its presence, one would not have expected the religious ending in such a poem as *T.C.* Such of Chaucer's other longish secular works as are finished have none (*B.D.*, *Mars*, *P.F.*).

[2] See also *Tristia* ii. 1, "Quid mihi vobiscum est, infelix cura, libelli?" He often personifies his book, or represents it as speaking (e.g., *Ex Ponto* ii. 7; *Tristia* iii. 1). In *Amores* ii. 15, he tells a ring to go, envies its good fortune, etc. The *Tristia* and *Pontic Epistles* of course were perfectly well known in the Middle Ages. Here and below I make no claim to tracing the complete history of the usage.

In addressing his book Ovid perhaps followed the example of Horace (*Epistles* i. 20. 1), *Vertumnum Ianumque, liber, spectare videris.*[1] But no one who reads the poems can think Ovid following a mere convention or using an artifice. His interest is fixed on his book's destination, and he shows his hope that it may get him called back.

This "Go Little Book" conceit, fanciful, confidential, and quaint, originating thus it would seem in the regrets of the exile, has passed on down to our own time. It is repeatedly adopted from Ovid[2] by Martial in his *Epigrams.*

> Argiletanas mavis habitare tabernas,
> Cum tibi, parve liber, scrinia nostra vacent.
> . . . . . .
> I, fuge; sed poteras tutior esse domi [i. 3].
>
> Vade salutatum pro me, liber: ire iuberis
> Ad Proculi nitidos, officiose, lares [i. 70].
>
> Romam vade, liber . . . . [iii. 4].
>
> Vis commendari sine me cursurus in urbem,
> Parve liber, multis, an satis unus erit? [iii.5].[3]

Statius bids a letter (*Silvae* iv. 4): "Curre per Euboicos non segnis, epistola, campos"; then tells it what to say. An epigram in the Greek anthology (xii. 208)[4] imitates the first poem in Ovid's *Tristia:*

> Εὐτυχές, οὐ *φθονέω, βιβλίδιον* . . . .
> *Χαρτάριον, δέομαι, πυκνότερόν τι λάλει.*

Since Ovid was pre-eminently the poet of love for the Middle Ages,

[1] There is a certain likeness in the sudden order to a servant at the end of a poem—
I, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello (Horace *Sat.* I. 10. 100).
I, puer, et citus haec aliqua propone columna (Propertius *Eleg.* iii. 23. 23).

[2] On the general and this particular influence of Ovid on Martial see Zingerle, *Martial's Ovid-Studien* (Innsbruck, 1877), pp. 1 ff., 27; H. M. Stephenson, *Selected Epigrams of Martial* (London, 1907), p. 181.

[3] See also ii. 1; iii. 2; iv. 86, 89; vii. 97; viii. 72; x. 104; xii. 3 (F. G. Schneidewin, Leipzig, 1881). Martial was unfamiliar in the Middle Ages, but was known to both Petrarch and Boccaccio; see Grandgent, *Dante* (New York, 1916), p. 238, and Sandys, *Hist. Class. Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1903–8), II, 6, 13. There is no evidence that Chaucer knew him.

[4] Loeb Classical Library edition. Statius ends his *Thebaid* with an address to it, "O Thebai" (xii. 811–16), "Vive, precor; nec tu divinam Aeneida tempta." Joseph of Exeter in the twelfth century, among whose chief models were Statius and Ovid, dismisses his *De bello Trojano* with (vi. 961) "Vive, liber, liberque vige."

we may see his influence in the address to the poem in the *envoi* of the courtly or love lyric in *Provençal:*

Chanzos, tu't n' iras outra mar.
Chanso, vai t' en a mon Plus-Avinen.[1]

By Provençal influence we often find the conceit in Old French chansons and other lyrics.

Chansonete, querre irés
La millor de la contrée.

Chançonete, tu iras
A mon ami, si li di . . . .[2]

It appears constantly in early and later Italian, especially in *canzoni:*

Canzonetta novella
Va, e canta nuova cosa.

Vanne a Tolosa, ballatetta mia.[3]

The address to the poem, "Canzon mia," etc., appears constantly in the *envois* to the *canzoni* and other lyrics of Dante[4] and Petrarch,[5] often with the "Go" in the former, rarely in the latter. It is an even more striking usage of Boccaccio, who probably followed the example of Ovid as well as of medieval poets. He not only uses it at the end of *canzoni* and *ballate,*[6] but also at the end of long poems,

[1] Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie* (Leipzig, 1912), pp. 63, 69. See also, e.g., *Chansons de Guillaume IX.* (ed. Jeanroy; Paris, 1913), p. 5. I owe several references to Drs. Johnston and Foster.

[2] By Gillebert de Berneville, in Scheler's *Trouvères belges du XIIe au XIVe siècle* (Brussels, 1876), I, 77, 121. See also *ibid.*, I, 83, 104, 106, 124, 136, 149; II, 101, 105, in poems by the above, Mathieu de Gand, and others; Paul Meyer, *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, 6 série, III, 149, 158; *Les plus anciens chansonniers français* ([ed. Brakelmann] *Ausg. u. Abh.*, XCIV, 4, 25, 40–53, etc., including a *sirventes* by Richard I of England); *Ausg. u. Abh.*, XCVIII, 40, 100, and *passim; Gesellschaft für rom. Litt.*, V, 142, 145. It is not a usage of the French lyrists whom Chaucer was most familiar with. The address to the "Little Book" is fitting in the classical instances, coming at the beginning (usually) or end of a single lyric or small volume of lyrics. In the medieval cases it comes at the end of a work, sometimes a long one. The diminutive, though often modest, betrays the classical origin of the conceit.

[3] By Jacopo da Lentino and Guido Cavalcanti (thirteenth century), in D'Ancona and Bacci's *Manvale* (I, 61, 115). See also D'Ancona and Comparetti, *Antiche Rime Volgari*, I, xxxviii; also *Scelta di Curiosità*, CLXXXV, 55, 63, 64.

[4] *Vita Nuova*, Ballata 1, canzoni 1 and 3; *Convivio*, canzoni 1–3; *Canzoniere*, Sestina 2, canzoni 9–12, 14–18, 20, 21.

[5] Edition of Dresden, 1774; Part I, Canzoni 1, 2, 4–6, 8–10, 12, 15–18, 20, 21; Part II, Canzoni 1, 3–5, and p. 428.

[6] Maghori-Moutier edition, XVI, 107, 110, 114, 121, 125, 129; and *Decam.*, IV, 10, end.

where it may be regarded as a short lyric closing a long narrative.[1] Thou, "o libro," he tells the *Teseide* (XII, 84), art the first to treat such a subject in the vulgar tongue, but shalt come perchance among poems of the older sort. "Canzon mia pietosa," he addresses the *Filostrato* (IX, 1), ... "te n' andrai Alla donna gentil della mia mente" (stanza 5); "or va" (stanza 8). He adopted it also at the end of his long prose works in Latin and Italian. At the end of certain of them he uses the diminutive, presumably out of modesty; "O picciolo mio libretto . . . . dinanzi dalle innamorate donne ti presenta . . . . Va adunque" (*Fiammetta*, chap. 9);[2] "Piccola mia operetta" (*Corbaccio*, end);[3] "O piccolo mio libretto," he apostrophizes the *Filocolo*.[4] He bids farewell to his *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium*—"Tu autem parve liber longum vive."[5]

Chaucer therefore in beginning his *envoi* "Go, litel book, go litel myn tregedie" was following a long and widespread tradition, as regards the address, the "go"[6] and the "litel"; a tradition which conveyed all the charm of modesty and of literary reminiscence, especially from Ovid. Boccaccio's usage was probably most in his mind, though not especially the ending of the *Filostrato*.[7] Nowhere before Boccaccio do I find the "little book" conceit at the end of a long work.[8]

[1] This lyric development is characteristic of this most original of writers; see note on p. 638 below.

[2] *Ibid.*, VI, 199, 200. The passage contains plain imitation of Ovid's *Tristia* i. 1 (and of Dante's *Inferno*, XX, 21).

[3] V, 255.

[4] viii. 376. There is much resemblance between the ending of this work and that of the *Troilus*, but the former lacks the request for correction (see later) found in the latter and in other works of Boccaccio. We may well see the influence of various of his works on the ending of the *Troilus*.

[5] Ed. Augsburg (1544), p. 273.

[6] In Chaucer the "go" is a mere farewell, without telling the book where to go. Elsewhere it is not a farewell but a direction.

[7] Troilus apostrophizes his first letter to Criseyde (II, 1091–92):

Lettre, a blisful destenee
Thee shapen is, my lady shal thee see.

Very likely spontaneous, but it recalls the Latin poets, and the *envoi* of the *Filostrato* (IX, 5), congratulating the poem because it is to see his lady:

O te felice, che la vederai.

[8] It is needless to follow the usage through later English poetry and prose, where it may be attributed more or less to the influence of the *Troilus* passage. Lydgate uses it over and over again (see Schick, *Lydgate's Temple of Glas* [E.E.T.S., 1891], p. 122); also Hoccleve (*Regement of Princes*, end, *Tale of Jonathas*, end, *Balade to the Duke of York*, l. 1); Caxton (*Book of Curtesye*, end [E.E.T.S.]; *Hist. of Reynard the Fox*, end, ed.

The fifth part of the Epilog follows a less common usage. Medieval writers occasionally ask for criticism, or correction (the usual word), from the person to whom a work is addressed or from the

---

by Goldsmid, II, 120); Skelton, James I of Scotland, Hawes, etc. (Schick, *op. cit.*). In Lydgate's *Black Knight* this form of *envoi* is found, as seldom, combined with the ballade form, "Princes . . . ." See also the end of the *Wallace* (Sc. Text Soc., XI, 1451, 1453), and various poems in Vol. VII of Skeat's *Oxford Chaucer*. It is used by Spenser in the *Epithalamion* ("Song, ..."), and by Bunyan in the poem preceding Part II of *Pilgrim's Progress*. When one finds it in Bill Nye it is time to stop. Two other matters in this stanza of the Epilog are worthy of note. Chaucer exhorts his book to kiss the steps of Virgil, Ovid, Homer, Lucan, and Statius. Whether he is thinking especially of authors used in this poem (so Skeat), or, as is more likely, of the antique sages of *Inferno*, IV, 82–102 (*M.L.N.*, XXIX, 97), or of the ending of Boccaccio's *Filocolo* (Young, *Story of T. and C.*, 178–79, but cf. also *Teseide*, XII, 85), his list of ancient writers is pretty much the common one; see *H.F.*, 1455 ff.; Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione*, V, 7 ff.; E. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, I, 6; *Anglia*, XIV, 237; Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, p. 79 (Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Horace, Juvenal, Statius always recognized as the chief poets). Secondly, as to—

> No making thou n' envye,
> But subgit be to alle poesye.

Chaucer always makes a clear distinction between "poete," "poetical," "poesye," "poetrye" on the one hand, and on the other "makere," "makying," "make." As applied to poetry the two sets of words seem about coeval in English, both hardly antedating the fourteenth century. The reference is to classical poetry with the word "poete" in *B.D.*, 54, *Boethius*, I, m. 1, III, p. 12, m. 12; *H.F.*, 1483, 1499, *Mel.*, 2686 probably, *Merch. T.*, 1732; "poetical" in *Boethius*, I, p. 1; "poetrye" in *T.C.V.*, 1855; *H.F*, 1001, 1478, *Sq.T.*, 206. When he disclaims figures of poetry and art poetical in *H.F.*, 858 and 1095, and bids the *Troilus* be subject to "alle poesye" (V, 1790), he refers to Latin poets and their usages. "The forme of olde clerkes speche in poetrye" which he says is to be found in the *Troilus* (V, 1854–55) refers not to Boccaccio but to real or fictitious classical models. "Poete" is used of Dante in *Monk's T.*, 3650 and *W.B.T.*, 1125, and "poete" and "poetrye" of Petrarch in *Cl. Prol.*, 31, 33. Of his own poetry he uses "make" and "makying" (*Adam*, 4; *T.C.V.*, 1788; *L.G.W.*, B-Prol., 188, 413, 538, 573, 579, 614, 618, 929, 2136); also of other vernacular love poetry (*L.G.W.*, B-Prol., 69, 74, *Venus*, 82, and cf. *R.R.*, 41). When he bids the *Troilus* envy no making but be subject to all poesy (V, 1789–90), he does not use the terms as synonyms, but says in effect, "Envy not your peers and submit yourself to your betters." For all that, if he would have accepted the word poetry for any of his own works, it would have been for the *Troilus;* he would certainly have felt it to be on a loftier plane (though not necessarily better) than anything else he ever wrote. There are indications that at this time he had been making a particular study of the traditional art of poetry. As to the nature of the distinction, it is not so much that he uses "makying," etc., of vernacular verse, and "poetrye," etc., of Latin. The latter refers to the loftier, more imaginative, and really or supposedly symbolical literature which is of course mostly in verse, and which to the Middle Ages is nearly all in Latin, the *Divine Comedy* being the chief exception. Lydgate (*Troy Book*, II, 5934) uses "poysie" in the same manner. Just so, careful writers today use "verse" for what does not deserve to be called "poetry"; we are still maintaining the dignity of that word. The sense of esoteric sacredness attaching to poetry is well illustrated by Hauvette (*Boccace*, p. 455). The conception of poetry as in essence symbolical of general truth runs through the last two books of Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum*, and of course was common in early and late Renascence writers. It is well illustrated in a letter by Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406): "hic loquendi modus poeticus est, falsitatem corticitus pre se ferens, intrinsecus vero latentem continens veritatem. huius rei peritia, doctrina sive ratio poesis dicitur, poetica vel poetria" (*Epistolario di C.S.*, ed. by F. Novati, Istituto Storico Italiano [Rome, 1905], IV, 177). The idea contributed greatly to the veneration for the higher poetry, and was a strong shield against its enemies; see pp. 650 ff. below. As to Chaucer's practice, again, he gives the

general reader.[1] Without of course claiming completeness or tracing origins, we may note the following cases. One "B," who wrote, about the year 1000, the earliest existing life of St. Dunstan, in words which it would be a pity not to give literally, asks Archbishop Elfric of Canterbury to have scratched or emended with a lamenting little pen of gushing ink whatever offends against the norm of orthography; also the sagacious of both sexes to do the like.[2]

high title to Petrarch, doubtless for his Latin poetry and possibly his Ciceronian prose, but not for his love poetry; out of modesty Petrarch disclaims the word Poeta for himself (*Invect. contra Medicum*, Book I, p. 1205 [Basle, 1554]). Dante is the sole vernacular poet to whom Chaucer gives it. In so ranking these two he follows the frequent example of Boccaccio (*De Gen. Deor.*, XIV, 10, 11, 19, 22; XV. 6; note, by the way, that Boccaccio states, XV, 6, that Petrarch is celebrated even in England). In giving the word poet to Dante, a writer in the *materno sermone*, Boccaccio showed more enterprise than Petrarch would have approved of. Boccaccio, though at times rejecting the title, puts in a modest claim to rank here himself, and Coluccio Salutati a little later calls him a poet (*Epistolario* III, 228), but here it seems Chaucer would not agree with them. It is in this direction that we are to see why Chaucer repeatedly names Dante and Petrarch and never Boccaccio. Chaucer mentions the name of no vernacular writer except Dante and Granson (*Venus*, 82), which must be taken as a special compliment to them; doubtless Gower (*T.C.*, V, 1856) is named as a friend, not as a writer. (Later he alludes to him as a writer, without naming him, in *M.L. Prol.*, 77 ff.) He names no vernacular work (other than his own) unless to make light of it (e.g., *Sir Th.*, 2087–90; *N.P.T.*, 4402), with the single exception of the *Roman de la Rose* (*R.R.*, 39; *B.D.*, 334; *L.G.W.*, 329, 441, 470; *Mch. T.*, 2032). This is a significant exception; it is full of "sentence," and its chief author, Jean de Meun, parades his classical erudition, seeks to make it seem more than it is, and dissimulates his still more important debts to medieval writers (Langlois, *Origines et sources du R.R.*, pp. 172–73). To the Middle Ages the *Roman de la Rose* would seem a "classic" in the same sense as the *Divine Comedy*. Boccaccio was mainly a vernacular poet, probably almost unknown in England, not fertile in "sentence," and not on the lofty level of Dante, who was already a classic, commented and lectured on. Authors in the Middle Ages being cited to give weight to the quotation, not credit to the author, Chaucer had no reason to name Boccaccio. We need make no mystery about his silence, as has so often been done (e.g., by Professor Lounsbury, *Studies in Ch.*, II, 234). Professor Kittredge also remarks on the pother as to Chaucer's silence, and well shows in this and that individual case how natural it is ("Chaucer's Lollius," *Harv. Studies in Class. Phil.*, XXVIII, 61 ff.). My point is that Chaucer seems to have taken pleasure in fathering narrative and "sentence" on Dante and Petrarch, and not on Boccaccio. This is the notable thing, to be explained as above. Other cases of *make*, etc., referring to vernacular poetry are in *Prol.* 325, *M.L.P.* 57, *L.G.W.* 364, 366, 437, 549. Something like Chaucer's distinction between ancient and vernacular poetry is sh own even in Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*.

[1] Not so among classical poets. They sometimes speak of their poems with modesty or deprecation (Catullus, No. 1; Ovid *Amores* i, prefatory epigram; *Tristia* iv. 1, etc.; Martial, prose Preface to *Epigrams*). But with the careful finish of classical Latin style, an author would hardly have risked suggesting liberties to his reader's pen, even out of hollow compliment. On the contrary, admiring readers often asked authors to visé their copies of the author's works (Martial vii. 11, 17; Bridge and Lake, *Select Epigrams of Martial* [Oxford, 1906], p. xxiii). Martial once, however, tells a friend or patron (*Epig.* vi. 1) that if he will polish the meter his (Martial's) poems will fear less to come to Caesar's hands.

[2] *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (Rolls Ser., 1874), pp. 1–2: "Eotenus, inquam, ut quicquid hac in editione contra orthographiae normam compositoris vitio usurpatum repereris, imperiali potentia abradere, ac ploranti pinnicula profluentis incausti in melius ab errore reformatum emendare praec ipias. Quinetiam utriusque ordinis in utroque sexu sagaces, ... , itidem facere permon eo."

Orm in his dedication charges the unfortunate Walter to scrutinize each verse of the *Ormulum*, that there be no word not good to trow and to follow. Guillaume Deguilleville in his early fourteenth-century *Pèlerinage de l'âme* hopes his readers

> doulcement corrigeront,
> Se riens y a a corriger,
> A amender ou retracter.[1]

With characteristic modesty, Boccaccio often thus invites criticism of his prose works. At the end of the *Ameto*, after addressing it (*la mando*) to Niccolò di Bartolo del Buono, he commits *l'esaminazione e la correzione* to the most holy church of Rome, to the wise, and to Niccolò.[2] At the end of the *Vita di Dante*, after speaking modestly of the work, he expresses willingness "sempre e in questo e in ogni altra cosa da ciascun più savio, laddove io difettosamente parlassi, essere corretto."[3] So also in Boccaccio's Latin works. In the introductory dedication of the *De Casibus* to Maghinardo degli Cavalcanti he hopes his friend will not find it tiresome to emend what is unbecoming; and in the conclusion, that the laureate Francesco Petrarca, his distinguished preceptor, will supply what is neglected, cut back what is superfluous, and emend anything not consonant with Christian religion or philosophical truth.[4] In the *De Genealogia Deorum* (XIV, 1) he wishes King Hugo IV, of Jerusalem and Cyprus (Hugh de Lusignan), at whose wish he wrote the book, to refute what is not fit for his royal charity and to commend what he finds laudable. At the end (XV, 14) he asks him to supply defects, cut out superfluities, repair inaccuracies, and all things according to his judgment correct and emend;[5] then adds that if the king is too busy, he entreats all upright and pious men, especially Francesco Petrarca, to remove any inadvertent errors or

[1] Schick, *Lydgate's Temple of Glas*, p. 123; this reappears in Caxton's edition (1483) of the English prose version (ed. K. I. Cust; London, 1859), p. 81.

[2] Vol. XV, pp. 200, 201.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[4] Pp. 2, 272; cf. *T.C.*, V, 1856–57, and pp. 652 ff. below.

[5] Pp. 352, 401. The king had died (1359) long before the publication (1371) of the work, which left Boccaccio's hands in an unrevised state (Hortis, *Opere Latine di Boccaccio* [Trieste, 1879], p. 158; Koerting, *Boccaccio's L. u. W.* [Leipzig, 1880], pp. 719–21; Hauvette, *Boccace*, p. 415; O. Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde*, p. 134); why he ignores the king's death is an unsolved puzzle. Dante characteristically never invites criticism; sending the *Paradiso* to Can Grande, he says in the letter now generally recognized as genuine, "vobis adscribo, vobis offero, vobis denique recommendo"—nothing more.

convert them to religious truth, for he wishes the work to be submitted to their judgment and discretion.[1]

Usually these requests for correction seem to be sincere. "B," in spite of his portentous style, perhaps was none too sure of his own latinity. Boccaccio is perhaps usually sincere, especially when he appeals to Petrarch; as we shall see, in the *De Genealogia* he is exceedingly anxious not to give religious offense. Further, with the medieval lack of all kinds of books of reference, any scholarly prose writer (as Boccaccio was underneath his verbiage and flattery) would be glad to have errors called to his notice, and even corrected by the discreet in copies to be used by scribes. Requests that errors be called to the writer's attention are common enough even in modern prefaces. The request was a high compliment to a dedicatee's learning and discretion, not too dangerous if he had sense enough not to take too much advantage of it. Sometimes, especially later, the request seems more conventional and perfunctory.

When Chaucer directs his book to moral Gower and philosophical Strode,

> To vouchen sauf, ther nede is, to corecte,
> Of your benignitees and zeles gode,

he is not necessarily, but not improbably may be, following Boccaccio's example.[2] He shows more boldness than Boccaccio, who

[1] There is a like request in Boccaccio's letter to Pietro di Monteforte (Hortis, p. 292). Cf. also the *Liber de Montibus*, p. 503; but he seems to warn, too, against rash correction. Laurent de Premierfait, in the prologue to his translation of Boccaccio's *De Casibus*, says it is proper to emend or correct not only one's own work but also others' (Hortis, p. 740), and acts accordingly; Lydgate praises him for so doing (Schick, *Lydgate's Temple of Glas*, p. 122).

[2] Of the works of Boccaccio quoted above several were well known to Chaucer, later at any rate, and there is no reason to doubt at the date of *T.C.* There was far more spontaneity and originality in the Middle Ages than the mechanical-minded critic always sees, and of course the foregoing precedents do not all constitute a lineal tradition. But it is pretty clear that Chaucer both continues and transmits one. In Chaucer's own works the passage in question is not the only one where he invites correction. In the midst of the climax of the *Troilus* (III, 1328–36, see p. 639 below) he invites experienced lovers to correct his words as they will. At the end of the part of the *S.N. Prol.* which in general is original with Chaucer, he speaks modestly of the merits of the legend, and prays his readers "that ye wol my werk amende" (84). On the date of the *Invocacio* in *S.N.P.*, there has been much difference of opinion. Compare Kittredge, *Date of Chaucer's Troilus* (Ch. Soc., 1909), pp. 40–41; Tatlock, *Devel. and Chron.*, p. xi; Brown, *Modern Philology*, IX, 12–16; E. P. Hammond, *Ch., a Bibl. Manual*, pp. 315–16. In *Pars. Prol.*, 55–60, he puts the "meditation" which follows "under correction of clerks," and protests again that he will "stand to correction." These requests are rather apart from the fiction, and are meant less for the tellers' auditors than for Chaucer's readers. But they have a more perfunctory sound than the request at the end of the *Troilus*,

never risked such an invitation in case of a poem. Doubtless Chaucer knew his men. The invitation was too unusual in England of that day to pass as a mere empty compliment. But as will appear in the next section, he may have had a particular reason for inviting their suggestions and appending their names.[1]

Far the most interesting part of the Epilog is the fourth (ll. 1835–55). To the historical imagination the twenty-sixth canto of Dante's *Inferno* scarcely shows a more impressive meeting of the ancient and medieval worlds than this:

> O yonge fresshe folkes, he or she,
> In which that love up groweth with your age,
> Repeyreth hoom from worldly vanitee,[2]
> And of your herte up-casteth the visage
> To thilke god that after his image
> Yow made, and thinketh al nis but a fayre
> This world, that passeth sone as floures fayre.

which differs from most of the parallels except those in Boccaccio by asking criticism from specified persons. The scribe sometimes invites correction of his errors; at the end of Chaucer's *Truth* in MS Fairfax 16 some Adam the Scrivener made his come-back with *Qui legit emendat scriptorem non reprehendat.*

[1] This usage too was followed in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England, largely doubtless after Chaucer's example. It is a highly sophisticated custom, contrasting with the purely pious ending of earlier and popular literature. No doubt it is often mere compliment or forestalling of criticism. The exaggerated compliment and humility are significant of the new kind of audience for which men were writing, and of the increased frequency of writing for literary patrons; all this points toward the literary conditions which prevailed till the eighteenth century. It is not enough recognized that sycophancy toward patrons is one reason for the poor and shop-worn character of fifteenth-century literature. For cases of the request see Schick, *op. cit.*, pp. 122–23, for many cases in Lydgate, Caxton, Skelton, and others; see also *Harv. Studies and Notes*, V, 213, and Lydgate's *Troy Book*, V, 3482; Hoccleve's *Balade to the Duke of York*, ll. 44 ff., which asks the amending and correcting of Master Picard; Caxton's *History of Reynard the Fox* (ed. Goldsmid, II, 120); his *Eneydos*, requesting Skelton's and others' corrections (*E.E.T.S.*, pp. 3, 4); *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* (ed. Sommer, I, 7); *Book of Curtesye*, (*E.E.T.S.*, end); *Golden Legend*, prologue; *History of Jason*, dedication. Compare Lyndesay's *Monarchie*, 11, 116–17; also Montaigne's *Essais*, I, chap. 56. He who runs may still read it (along with the "Go little book") in the address to the user in the front matter of Baedeker's guides (English editions), taken from Ros's *Belle Dame sans Merci* (*Oxford Chaucer*, VII).

[2] The other world as man's home is a common medieval idea. See Chaucer's *Truth*, 17, 19; Boethius, *De Cons. Phil.* i, p. 5; *Roman de la Rose*, 5015 ff., and the Middle English version, 5657 ff. (both in the Chaucer Soc. edition); the *Ormulum*, 7491; the end of Thomas Aquinas' well-known hymn, *O Salutaris*,

> Qui vitam sine termino
> Nobis donet in patria;

also Orosius' *Historiae adversum Paganos*, V, 2: "Utor temporarie omni terra quasi patria, quia quae vera est et illa quam amo patria in terra penitus non est." There is a rather mundane parallel to these first two stanzas in *Merch. T.*, 1275–76 and thereabouts; the *amours* of bachelors are but childish vanity compared with the stable bliss of married folks. The passage is ironical and has none of the sudden shift. Another reference on "God's country" is St. Gregory, *Moralia*, XXXI, 21 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, LXXVII, 601–2).

And loveth him, the which that right for love
Upon a cros, our soules for to beye,
First starf, and roos, and sit in hevene a-bove;
For he nil falsen no wight, dar I seye,
That wol his herte al hoolly on him leye.
And sin he best to love is, and most meke,
What nedeth feyned loves for to seke?

Lo here, of Payens corsed olde rytes,
Lo here, what alle hir goddes may availle;
Lo here, these wrecched worldes appetytes;
Lo here, the fyn and guerdon for travaille
Of Jove, Appollo, of Mars, of swich rascaille!
Lo here, the forme of olde clerkes speche
In poetrye, if ye hir bokes seche.

Here we see Catholic tradition and classic-Renascence tradition in combat, and the victory for the time with the Catholic. That Chaucer was sincere in this quasi-retraction of his great love poem goes without saying. His sublimation of earthly to heavenly love and of pagan to Christian faith can leave no one unmoved. Yet to some modern readers the passage is surprising, even unaccountable, and one cannot but ask, I trust without distressing analyses and prying about as if we were the devil's spies—one cannot but ask, I say, why he wrote it. We must not regard this ending as merely throwing back an ironical light over what precedes, so that we should read the story a second time with quickened understanding. The feeling in the Epilog is in no way foreshadowed at the beginning or elsewhere; it does not illumine or modify; it contradicts.[1] The heartfelt worldly tale is interpreted in an unworldly sense. He tells the whole story in one mood and ends in another.[2]

[1] It illustrates the looser conception of unity prevailing in medieval poetry, just as the presentment of Criseyde's personality does, according to one interpretation of it. In each case the tale develops in a free, expansive, and sympathetic way, and then at the end swerves back to tradition. Knowing his readers to be aware of what Criseyde will finally do, Chaucer feels no responsibility for making it seem inevitable, and devotes himself to making her *simpatica*. A Criseyde such as Chaucer represents her may seem unlikely to do as she does at the end, but a Criseyde notoriously foredoomed to do so might have appeared like Chaucer's Criseyde.

[2] The ending gives the poem some of the manner of the allegory and the fable, except that the interpretation is sudden and arbitrary. In somewhat like manner Boccaccio's prose romance *Ameto* ends its chronicle of social scandal clad in voluptuous symbols by sublimating its characters into the theological and cardinal virtues, who sing the praise of the Trinity. His manner of getting his literary fun, and then saving himself by saying he didn't mean it, gives one more esteem for his ingenuity than for his

The first two stanzas express the natural enough revulsion of a medieval mind to the strong emotion and painful outcome of the love story. Throughout Chaucer shows greater depth than Boccaccio in the *Filostrato*, being more critical as well as older when he wrote it; which makes the passage at first more surprising, but also more accountable. A revulsion it is, or, if anyone prefers, a sudden transcending. It is not enough to sum up the poem by saying—this is the loveliness and tragedy of human life—but there is something better than human life. Though in the opening lines of the poem and all through we are warned of the tragedy to come, a touching and dignified tragedy it is to be, there is a sense that nothing is better than happy love, and a pretense that the poet is a wistful outsider to the greatest thing in the world. There is not a hint of detachment or sense of the vanity or unworthiness of love.[1] This, like many emotional poems, is to sober the thoughtless and happy, and open their hearts to the woes of the luckless. The opening is full of religion, but it is the religion of love. And now all the importance of the story is snatched from it. We are prepared to find false felicity a tragedy, but not a flitting shadow on a wall.

---

sincerity. Chaucer's good sense made him disavow rather than allegorize his voluptuousness and paganism. There is no trace anywhere in Chaucer's works of the allegorizing or euhemerizing treatment of mythology (on which see p. 645 below), a notable tribute to his strength of mind. The modern finds more pleasure in Chaucer's way, artless though it seems. "You," he says to his young friends of his own day, "don't you do as the pagans did; they knew no better." Usually it is only our heedlessness and ignorance that makes Chaucer seem artless. Witness the subtle dramatic skill with which he makes the Franklin condemn for his own day the practices on which his tale hinges.

[1] And preyeth for hem that ben in the cas
Of Troilus, as ye may after here,
That love hem bringe in hevene to solas [I, 29–31].

And biddeth eek for hem that been at ese,
That god hem graunte ay good perseveraunce,
And sende hem might hir ladies so to plese,
That it to Love be worship and plesaunce.
For so hope I my soule best avaunce,
To preye for hem that Loves servaunts be,
And wryte hir wo, and live in charitee [I, 43–9].

Rhetoric of course, but it leads harmoniously if rather seriously into the tale. Later the talk of changeful fortune, false felicity, and the doom hanging over the city would prepare even one ignorant of the story for a defeat of love, but a painful and worthy defeat. As to Chaucer's disclaimer of knowing love, it was not meant to be greeted with a smile. What he means is this peculiar combination of love, poetry, conventionality, sentimentalism, and sensuality, which may well have been outside his experience.

In the earlier form of the poem the blow is particularly sudden,[1] and it was probably to lessen the shock that Chaucer inserted the three stanzas from the *Teseide*, and made Troilus himself gently lead us upward by himself learning to condemn

al our werk that folweth so
The blinde lust, the which that may not laste.

Further, Chaucer had his audience to think of. How far at the end he was voicing his own feeling and how far theirs, who can say? But both must have weighed. Fictitious narrative was fresher to the medievals, made a keener impression on them than on us, and it is hard to exaggerate the piercing reality which they must have felt in this poem. This is partly due to the unparalleled veracity of the story and partly to its large use of lyric expression, more novel, agreeable, and impressive to the fourteenth-century reader of romance than to us.[2] High and ennobling as the poem is, in no other medieval work is physical passion depicted with such naturalness and sympathy and made so attractive. Elsewhere sensuous narrative tends to be comic, and serious love narrative to be reserved. The senses, being outlawed by medieval theory, could be indulged only in a light mood. None of Chaucer's other love stories is intense enough to call for such a disclaimer. It is certain also that he was presenting social conditions which he knew would seem strange to English readers.[3] The court of Edward of England

[1] Directly after Troilus' tragic death comes the ascetic disavowal of all that had made his life charming, and the call to a higher love. The disavowal at the end rings truer than the love piety at the beginning, which is of a piece with the conventional element throughout the poem. To disentangle the traditional from the real is the chief problem of the poem, not yet solved. They are mingled all through, for here as elsewhere Chaucer's method is the vivifying of the traditional.

[2] This was one of Boccaccio's great contributions to narrative, due to the fact that he wrote in an age remarkable for lyric.

[3] This is quite clear from II, 27–49. In sundry ages and lands there are sundry usages to win love; we are not to wonder at Troilus' way, or say "I would not do so," many roads lead to Rome—

Eek in som lond were al the gamen shent,
If that they ferde in love as men don here,
As thus, in open doing or in chere,
In visitinge, in forme, or seyde hir sawes;
For-thy men seyn, ech contree hath his lawes.

In II, 365–80 (not in the *Filostrato*), it is doubtless insincerely that Pandarus to embolden Troilus imports English social freedom into this Italianate Troy, in contrast with the passage above. Here is one among various instances of that combination of the exotic and artificial with the universal and realistic which adds so much to the interest and beauty of the poem, yet makes its interpretation so hard. There is more than tradi-

was neither so artificial nor so immoral as the court of Robert of Naples (for all Mrs. Alice Perrers and other occasional scandals). Earlier in the poem too he shows a like consciousness. He invites his auditors (III, 1324–36) to do as they will with his additions to the story, and declares that he speaks always subject to the correction of those acquainted with love, to add or diminish as they will:

> But sooth is, though I can not tellen al,
> As can myn auctor, of his excellence,
> Yet have I seyd, and, god to-forn, I shal
> In every thing al hoolly his sentence.
> And if that I, at loves reverence,
> Have any word in eched for the beste,
> Doth therwith-al right as yourselven leste.
>
> For myne wordes, here and every part,
> I speke hem alle under correccioun
> Of yow, that feling han in loves art,
> And putte it al in your discrecioun
> T' encrese or maken diminucioun
> Of my langage, and that I yow bi-seche;
> But now to purpos of my rather speche.

This is in the midst of the climax of the story. The fact may have no significance, but the insertion is probably due to the intense character of the climax, beyond even what it is in Boccaccio. Four points are notable. There is a similar less conciliatory passage at the beginning of the climax (III, 1193–97):

> I can no more, but of thise ilke tweye,
> To whom this tale sucre be or soot,
> Though that I tarie a yeer, som-tyme I moot,
> After myn auctor, tellen hir gladnesse,
> As wel as I have told hir hevinesse.

Secondly, the passage 1324–37, in some MSS representing a revised version, is removed to the end of the amorous climax, as if to make clearer to what part it refers especially.[1] Again, the other passage

tional "courtly love" in it; otherwise Chaucer would not have been moved to his final disclaimer. Clandestine love was familiar enough in literature to Chaucer's readers, and he, a court poet steeped in the same love poetry which they read, was familiar with their notions as to love affairs. Elements in the poem which otherwise would have been almost unnoticed he realized would acquire strong effect from its reality and emotionality.

[1] Root, *Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus* (Ch. Soc., 1916), 157, 250.

(V, 1858) where Chaucer invites correction is in a like connection, shortly after he disowns the amorous vanity of the poem. Finally, in several parts of the *Canterbury Tales* there is an analogous apology in analogous circumstances.[1] With the wholly new intensity and reality of the poem, then,[2] such an ending may well have been felt as satisfying and as more fitting than an unreligious close or a mere perfunctory muttered *Qui cum Patre*.

But in the third stanza, why this objurgation of pagans' cursed old rites, and all this about the futility of their gods and the empty reward of service to Jove, Apollo, Mars, and such rabble?

The *Troilus* is a learned poem. In its use of classical myth and so far as possible of classical lore in general it goes beyond anything else Chaucer wrote.[3] Its ancient coloring proves much

[1] Ladies, I prey yow that ye be nat wrooth;
I can nat glose, I am a rude man [*Merch. T.*, 2350–51].

In swich manere, it may nat ben expressed
But if I wolde speke uncurteisly [*ibid.*, 2362–63].

Cf. also *Prol.*, 725–42, *Mill. Prol.*, 3169–86, *Manc. T.*, 205–11; also *H.F.*, I, 245–48.

[2] This is the point. Had the poem contained no more than certain social pretenses about love, and an exaltation of fortune and destiny at the expense of providence and free will, there would have been nothing unusual enough to call out an unusual ending.

[3] Professor Kittredge was the first to show this feature of the poem in detail, in an article which by a current of brilliant sense clears the air of the Lollius mystification. See "Chaucer's Lollius," in *Harv. Studies in Class. Phil.*, XXVIII, 47–133, especially pp. 50–54; also Cummings, *Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (Cincinnati, 1916), p. 67, who had previously touched on the matter; and Ayres in *Romanic Rev.*, X, 9–10. Kittredge says, p. 50: "In furtherance of his general fiction as to source, and with the same purpose of lending his work an air of truth and vividness and authenticity, Chaucer added a multitude of classical touches that are wanting in the *Filostrato*." I do not believe, nor apparently does Professor Kittredge, that the main purpose of the classical touches was to carry out the Lollius fiction. I should be as ready to believe that the case stood the other way around. A small amount or entire absence of ancient details would have excited nobody's skepticism as to the Lollius source. The emphasis on the ancient source and that on the ancient setting are both in the service of the air of veracity. It is because he had meant to reproduce ancient life that he says:

Lo here, the forme of olde clerkes speche
In poetrye, if ye hir bokes seche! [V, 1854–55].

This shows a consciousness that he has been writing in a style new to his countrymen, that he is in a sense reviving the antique style. But "old clerks" does not mean Boccaccio, nor particularly the supposed ancient writer Lollius. How far Chaucer felt the Italian Renascence in Boccaccio to be a revival of the manner of Ovid and others, and how far he recognized it as something wholly new, is hard to say. As to the nature of the ancient detail, study of the ancients was so nearly confined to purely literary reading that there is little in the *Troilus* by way of "antiquities." In the *Franklin's Tale*, where he was demonstrably desirous of an ancient atmosphere, he got it only by means of ancient names and paganism. But here he had it in mind to recognize such of these other matters as he found in literature (e.g., V, 302 ff., cremation, "pleyes palestral," offering arms to the gods; cf. Virgil *Aen.* xi. 7–8). Pandarus refers to Oenone's letter to Paris (i. 652–58; from Ovid's *Heroides*) in an offhand domestic sort of way, as if it

careful reading and wariness in composing.[1] It is certain that Chaucer took pains to avoid such an excess of contemporary medieval color as would have marred the remote romantic background which gave dignity to the emotional romance.[2] The penetrating

had been talked over in the family, a device well known to historical novelists. He often uses ancient words which he feels it necessary to define (sometimes incorrectly). Troilus asks that the ashes of his heart be put "in a vessel, that men clepeth an urne" (V, 311). Diomed speaks of the "Manes, which that goddes ben of peyne" (V, 892), and of Calchas' possible "ambages," which he takes two lines to define (V, 897–99), alluding to the well-known equivocations of oracles. Criseyde swears by "Satiry and Fauny," and defines them as "halve goddes of wildernesse" (IV, 1544–45); also by the Simois as the river running through Troy (1548–49). Pandarus refers to Tityus as tormented by "foules that highte volturis" (I, 788). See also V, 319. The hasty modern reader thinks all this pedantry, as if Chaucer were airing his learning; his real purpose was to make his coloring intelligible to an age greedy of information and without dictionaries, as in the explanatory footnotes of such a historical novelist as Georg Ebers. The use of hard words with explanations is extremely common in Chaucer's *Boethius*, written about this time. His art may seem at times artless, but it is not pedantry (cf. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, III, 365 ff.). The lines (II, 22–25),

> Ye knowe eek, that in forme of speche is chaunge
> With-inne a thousand yeer, and wordes tho
> That hadden prys, now wonder nyce and straunge
> Us thinketh hem; and yet they spake hem so,

show Chaucer's consciousness of strange words and turns of language. Their abundance may be one reason why he prays for his poem (V, 1797–98)

> And red wher-so thou be, or elles songe,
> That thou be understonde I god beseche!

Cf. my *Scene of the Fkl. T. Visited*, p. 36. . . . . There is an interesting later Old French parallel to Chaucer's use of local color. About 1450–52 Jacques Milet wrote his dramatized *Istoire de la Destruction de Troye la Grant*, founded on the usual medieval sources. He made a conscious effort to diffuse ancient color over his work, and to restore ancient life. This was most successful, because easiest, in religious matters; he strives to introduce the gods and pagan religious practices, and also such things as the burning of the dead. In battle scenes he is medieval, and in general seems hardly to color as successfully as Chaucer does. See *Ausg. u. Abh.*, LIV (Meybrinck, *Auffassung der Antike bei J. Milet*), XCVI (Häpke, *Kritische Beiträge zu J. Milet's dramatischer Istoire*), and the reproduction of the *editio princeps* by E. Stengel (Marburg and Paris, 1883). Among Chaucer's French and English contemporaries, as in such a work as Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, which is full of ancient fiction, there is little or no attempt at such artful coloring.

[1] The knight in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* (1085) "walweth and he turneth to and fro" in bed. Troilus (V, 211–12) goes to bed, "and weyleth there and torneth In furie, as dooth he, Ixion, in helle." A few (not many) of the later revisions in the poem seem meant to increase the ancient color (Root, *Textual Tradition*, p. 201, and my *Devel. and Chronol.*, p. 5).

[2] The poem was as romantic to the fourteenth-century reader as to us, but for a different reason. It is romantic to us because it is medieval; we are not greatly impressed with the ancient touches, and take them for granted, while the medieval touches give an incongruity which may even make the modern smile at times, but in general are the cue for a sensation of romance. What strikes the modern in the matter of setting is the religious festival in honor of the Trojan relic (I, 153), Troilus "catching attrition" (I, 557), Criseyde discovered sitting in her paved parlor listening to the romance of Thebes (II, 82–84), her protest that she should be reading saints' lives in a cave (117–18), her reflection that she is not a nun (759), the reference to Jove's Christmas ("natal Joves fest," III, 150; see a similar mixture in Dante, *Purg.*, VI, 118–19, "o sommo Giove, Che fosti in terra per noi crocifisso"). Such things as these the medieval reader took for granted and passed with hardly a glance. But he was greatly impressed with the strangeness of the ancient detail. Sometimes his reaction would be complex. When

modern is surprised at the small number of anachronisms.[1] Of course we find God and the devil often mentioned, and occasionally other Christian phraseology, but without question Chaucer avoided it. Such things as distinctively Christian oaths are rare; no saint is mentioned.[2] Consciously ancient touches, on the other hand, surprise us by their frequency and variety. Where they come from we need not inquire just now, but they must represent much reading for this very purpose. It is safe to say that Chaucer could hardly have put in more without pedantry and "forcing it." Whether deliberately or not, so far as he could, Chaucer precisely undid the medievalizing introduced into the Troy story by Benoit de S. Maure.[3]

Criseyde, to hearten Troilus, talks to him and plans to talk to her father with blasphemous skepticism about the gods (IV, 1397–1411), and when Troilus curses them (V, 206–8), this is partly realism—the sort of thing a desperate medieval lover might have said of his own religion, much what Aucassin says in *Aucassin et Nicolette;* it would also have edified a serious medieval to hear a pagan speak of the pagan gods just as an orthodox divine would have done (though Chaucer was not aiming at this effect). Such passages are examples of Chaucer's skill in realizing the strange. His realism makes the strange no less strange, but more memorable. Criseyde's speech just mentioned is particularly curious. It is founded on nothing in Boccaccio, but developed from passages in Guido's *Historia* (Strassburg, 1489, sig.I3ro) and Statius' *Thebaid* (III, 661). A superior medieval reader might have been struck as we are by Criseyde's air of infidelity, and have thought she risked joining Statius' Capaneus, whom she here quotes, in Dante's *Inferno*, canto XIV. On the other hand her sentiments literally are unexceptionable from a Christian point of view (cf. Guido, sig.E4vo; Vincent of Beauvais, *Spec. Hist.*, X, 85; *Spec. Mor.*, III, iii, 27; Lydgate, *Troy Book*, II, 5916 ff.; Orosius, *Hist. adv. Paganos*, VI, 1, opined that men, knowing the one God, invented many gods through undiscerning fear). The docile and small-minded reader would have liked her the better for showing disaffection to paganism, just as a narrow-minded Protestant might exult to hear that the people of Brazil are not good Catholics. Likewise much of Pandarus' skepticism as to dreams, etc. (V, 358 ff.), is good theology. Few medievals would have thought of either as a skeptic.

[1] There is less than the hasty reader thinks. It was no more an anachronism to call the Palladium a relic and Amphiorax a bishop (II, 104) than for us to call a minister of Jupiter a priest ("presbyter" writ small). Some of the medieval language only heightened for the medieval reader the actuality of the ancient element. Christian language was constantly applied in the Middle Ages to the religion of love (cf. Dodd, *Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower*, pp. 190 ff.). To the superficial modern all this is merely incongruous and "quaint"; to the medieval, more familiar with church language than with anything else in the poem, it made the picture of ancient life more serious and lifelike.

[2] Saint Idiot (I, 910) is not in the calendar.

[3] Benoit, also sophisticated and ingenious, is remarkably careful about the ancient proprieties for a twelfth-century poet, but much less elaborately than Chaucer and with more mixture of the incongruous medieval. He never shows aversion to paganism. Guido delle Colonne, on the other hand, who put Benoit's work into Latin at the pleasure of the archbishop of Salerno, makes a point more than once of expressing aversion, and of explaining away such striking pagan prodigies as oracles. That is, where the Troy narrative of Benoit is noxiously heathen, Guido proffers an antidote (1489 edition, sig.E4vo, I3ro, etc.).

When we compare the *Troilus* with its source all this is more striking. Not only does little of its ancient air come from the *Filostrato*, much of it being inserted even where he is translating closely;[1] there is five or ten times as much in the English poem as in the Italian, even in proportion to its greater length. Further, such things in the *Filostrato* are commonplace and facile in character; youthful though not juvenile, it is hardly a learned poem. In the *Troilus* such details are on the whole not such as an ordinary well-read man could have drawn at will from his memory. Its heedful congruity becomes still more striking when we compare it with Chaucer's other poems of ancient setting, the *Knight's Tale*, the *Legend of Good Women*, the *Monk's*, the *Physician's*, the *Franklin's*, and the *Manciple's* tales. In them, it is true, he usually applies or retains enough ancient coloring to secure a certain fitness, and usually does not greatly medievalize,[2] but in none of them do we find the same effort for an intimate[3] use of mythology so conspicuous in the *Troilus*, and much of it was inevitable considering their sources. It will pay particularly to consider the *Knight's Tale*. It has as much ancient color as the *Troilus*, if not more; this is only natural, since the poem deals with externals, not primarily with feelings. But there are these differences. Instead of increasing the ancient color of the *Teseide*, Chaucer has greatly reduced it; the *Teseide* is more classical than the *Knight's Tale*, the *Filostrato*,

[1] Here are a few fair specimens of Chaucer's method:

Daun Phebus or Apollo Delphicus [I, 70]. Del grande Apollo . . . . [*Fil.*, I, 8]
Fro Flegiton, the fery flood of helle [III, 1600]. . . . . d' inferno . . . . [III, 56]
Ther-as the doom of Mynos wolde it dighte [IV, 1188]. . . . . nell' inferno . . . . [IV, 120]
And Attropos, make redy thou my bere! [IV, 1208]. . . . . ch' io me ne vo sotterra [IV, 123].

See also *T.C.*, I, 859, 878; II, 1062; III, 1428, 1807; V, 3, 7; for considerable passages added see IV, 1138 ff., 1538 ff., 1543 ff.

[2] In the *Franklin's Tale* he is especially careful of his ancient color, for a very special reason; but he expresses the lowest opinion of certain of the pagan rites, thus producing an effect of detachment. In the *Legend* he deliberately introduces ecclesiastical color into ancient matter. He knew how to vary his harmonizing or accompaniment, to an extent rare in the Middle Ages.

[3] Contrast the manner of the *Troilus* with the detached air of, e.g., *L.G.W.*, 786–87, 2602, *Fkl.T.*, 1131–34, 1271–72, 1292–93. The ancient examples in the *Monk's T.* are baldly told; there is little regard for setting in the *Phys. T.* In the *Manc. T.* ancient color seems conspicuously avoided, Ovid's story being here metamorphosed into a moral example with *fabliau* traits.

even the *Troilus*.[1] He is less careful to exclude the medieval. The mythology is less varied and learned. Finally, it is treated less congruously and seriously; there is more tendency to identify the gods with the like-named planets, which would make the power attributed to them less strange to a medieval;[2] a tendency, also, which accords with the lighter tone of the work, to treat ancient beliefs and rites humorously.[3] All this means that Chaucer took more trouble over the ancient atmosphere of the *Troilus* and took it more seriously.

The effect of Chaucer's resurrection of antiquity on his fourteenth-century audience is a subtle subject which requires nicety of interpretation as well as grasp of fact. Here I shall merely suggest a little of it. If we fill our imagination for a few moments with the literature in English and French to which they were used, we shall feel, as they must have felt, how remarkable is the realization of the strange in the *Troilus*. No earlier vernacular poem had been set in so fitting and remote a background, yet none had presented such keenly natural people, or such intensely real emotion, and their momentum had carried their surroundings with them into the current of life or vivid illusion. But the Englishman of the fourteenth century was not ready to accept these surroundings.[4] He was not only almost without historical sense, and vital historical knowledge, and feeling for relativity; the groundwork of his education and all his convictions was the absolute. Above all, his religion

[1] It may be in the *Teseide* that Chaucer found the suggestion for an elaborate classical setting; cf. such passages as *Tes*, III, 44; IV, 54; XI, *passim*. See H. M. Cummings, *Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to Italian Works of Boccaccio*, p. 67, and Kittredge, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–51; also *Jour. of Engl. and Germ. Phil.*, XIV, 226–55, especially p. 255. In his *Filocolo* also Boccaccio is very attentive to his ancient coloring (largely from Ovid).

[2] See note on p. 645, below.

[3] In *K.T.*, 2284–88, there is a waggish reference to Emily's ceremonial ablutions, and in 2809–15 a frivolous-sounding summary of the fate of Arcite's departed soul; this is not due merely to having used the original already in the *Troilus;* see Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 513–15, Kittredge in the *Nation*, LIV, 231, Tatlock in *Modern Philology*, XIV, 266. Finally there is the passage (2925–28) where when the trees are cut down, "the goddes ronnen up and doun" (like rabbits or field mice; cf. 2929–30); this is in the *Teseide*, but seriously.

[4] The impression may have been like, but many times as intense as that made some years ago by Sienkiewicz' *Quo Vadis*, which so remarkably realized personages like Nero, who to most people had been mere bookish outlines. Of course the same is true more or less of all successful historical fiction. But the point is that we moderns are used to the effort to realize the remote, and the fourteenth century was not. As Gaston Paris said, "Ce moyen âge ... traduisait *milites* par *chevaliers* sans se douter de la différence qui existait entre ces deux termes" (*Litt. franç. au moyen âge*, p. 75).

discouraged welcoming a strange point of view. The usual late medieval treatment of paganism forbade understanding it. Either it was minimized;[1] or it was condemned;[2] or it was assimilated to medievalism.[3] Cupid and Venus were adopted as harmless traditional personifications or symbols; the gods who gave their names to planets could be taken somewhat seriously without too much shock, for indeed this identification afforded a plausible explanation of why they had come to be adored as gods;[4] the medieval caught at every chance to see Christian verities shadowed darkly in pagan tradition.[5] This allegorizing attitude had been due to the

[1] The Homeric account of the Trojan War was rejected because it shows the gods as visibly fighting among men (Benoit's *Roman de Troie*, ll. 60 ff.; Guido's *Historia Trojana*, Prol.; Lydgate's *Troy Book*, Prol., ll. 267 ff.). Guido contrasts Christian truth with the errors of those "credentes et putantes eos esse deos quorum potentia nulla erat, ... cum per gloriosum adventum domini nostri Jesu Christi ubique terrarum idolatria tota cessaverit, et suo penitus evanuerit exhausto vigore" (Strassburg, 1489, sig.E4vo). But it is all wrong to speak of Guido as the "source" of Chaucer's final attack on paganism.

[2] It was assumed (for a single instance) that heathens were wicked; this especially where heathenism could not be ignored, as in legends of martyrs. E.g., "A man þat lifed in maumetry And in fals goddes, ful of enuy" (Horstmann, *Altengl. Legenden*, N.F., p. 3; see also Gower, *Vox Cl.* II, x, 1 ff.; *Cursor Mundi*, 2304). In keeping with this idea certain types of virtuous heroine in pagan stories are given Christian traits; two sensitive critics have pointed this out for such an innocent as Dorigen in the *Franklin's Tale*, and such a lamb in the midst of wolves as Cordelia in early forms of the Lear story (W. M. Hart in *Haverford Essays*, p. 199; Perrett in *Palaestra*, XXXV, 49). Vincent of Beauvais declares that the Greeks were worse in their religion than the Chaldeans and adored immoral gods (*Spec. Hist.*, XVI, 34). Chaucer's Man of Law and Prioress show in their tales the same feeling toward non-Christian religions.

[3] E.g., the mythology was euhemerized or allegorized, or the gods were recognized as real beings, demons; see Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, V, 835 ff., 1500 ff., *Cursor Mundi*, 2286 ff., Lydgate's *Troy Book*, II, 5391, 5826, 5916, 5925 ff., Boccaccio's *De Gen. Deor.*, I, 3, Guido's *Historia*, sig.E4vo., I3ro., Vincent of Beauvais, *Spec. Hist.*, II, 102, *Spec. Mor.*, III, iii, 27; also St. Augustine, *Confess.*, I, 16, and Isidor, *Etymol.*, VIII, 11. It is remarkable that Chaucer never does any of this. If mythology appears at all it is accepted. Of course medieval writers differ greatly in sophistication and secularity; Benoit is not to be lumped with writers of legends, or with Gower.

[4] Cf. p. 644 above. Dante accepts this explanation. His attitude to the gods is complex; *Inf.*, I, 72; *Par.*, IV, 61–63, etc. None of the Olympian gods appear in hell (as they do in Milton), and the Giants are punished in the nethermost pit for rebellion against Jove (*Inf.*, XXXI, 92). Here is one of the Renascence traits of Dante, whose attitude may have been noticed by both Boccaccio and Chaucer. Identification with the planets accounts for the air of half-belief which sometimes accompanies mention of the classic deities in Chaucer and elsewhere, and even sometimes seems to determine which are mentioned. It was not pure fiction to recognize the power of Venus, Mars, and the rest. A good case of this rehousing of the gods is in Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*. See also Isidor, *Etymol.*, III, 71.

[5] Consider the messianic interpretation of the *Fourth Eclogue* of Virgil and various allegorizings of his works; Comparetti, *Vergil in the M.A.*, pp. 99–103, etc.; Koerting, *Petrarca's Leben u. Werke*, pp. 482–83; Sandys, *Hist. of Class. Scholarship*, I, 610, 615, 616; II, 5. Even Petrarch found that in the fictions of the poets "allegoricus sapidissimus ac iucundissimus sensus inest" (*Invect. c. Med.* [Basle, n.d.], Book I, p. 1205).

medieval inability or unwillingness to face the fact that the ancients were really different from themselves. Now it is a question how Chaucer's innovation would have seemed to the more sensitive Englishman of his day. All through a very long poem by a contemporary, to have it forced into his perceptions that people precisely like those whom he knew, only more attractive, really bowed to strange and sensual gods; to find Juno invoked for grace instead of Mary, and Mercury instead of Michael guiding departed souls, to hear calls for help from God and Minerva together,[1] to find God's love and Jove's *amours* both inspired by Venus the goddess,[2] to find such things taken for granted and perpetually forced, I say, into his consciousness, and to find the Christian view of the world pointedly ignored all through—all this may well have caused a certain sense of strangeness, in some possibly of discomfort. It would have startled those convictions on which rested both his piety, his conduct, and his theory of the universe. "Quel ébranlement pour les consciences," exclaims Renan, speaking of the new understanding of Islam in the thirteenth century, "le jour où l'on s'aperçoit qu'en dehors de la religion que l'on professe, il en est d'autres qui lui ressemblent et qui ne sont pas après tout entièrement denuées de raison!"[3] There are signs in the passage under discussion that the passion in the poem was felt to express not only "courtly love" but also the moral ideas belonging to paganism. Paganism was dead, to be sure, but its professors in the *Troilus* were very much alive. I do not say that such a feeling as I suggest would be logical or easily defined; the feeling of mental discomfort usually is not. But it would be natural.

Some background will help in understanding the feeling, though one cannot reach clear-cut conclusions. How far was faith secure? How far was the ancient classic disapproved? This is a subject

[1] St. Gregory was not the last to be displeased by such things: "In uno se ore cum Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt" (*Epist.* xi. 54, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1171).

[2] *T.C.*, IV, 1116–17; V, 1827; II, 1060–63; III, 8–21. It is not that this lowering of the divine nature would shock (cf. Lounsbury, *Studies*, II, 505 ff.). I am not referring to any seeming irreverence but to a cool acceptance of polytheism. The medieval God might be treated familiarly, provided he received proper recognition. Consider the medieval attitude toward astrology and especially necromancy. The distinction and emphasis are thoroughly in the medieval spirit.

[3] *Averroès et l'Averroisme*, p. 281.

on which any generalization not so dogmatic as to be misleading may be so vague as to be of little use. It is hard to argue from general European conditions during centuries to the state of mind of Chaucer's own circle, and of that we know little. All we know is something of what his associates read, and a little of what they wrote. Yet medieval ideas were cosmopolitan and on the whole static, and Chaucer must have brought to his own circle even more knowledge than they already had of European, especially Italian, conditions.

As to the theological side of the matter, little significant background is available. Of course no intelligent person could at any time have actually apprehended a revival of paganism. Any indications that way are not to be taken seriously.[1] Nor was there

[1] Unusual cases, of small value as evidence, are the very ones that get mentioned. One of the charges against the worldly and dissolute pope John XII in the council which condemned him (963) was this: "in ludo aleae Iovis, Veneris, ceterorumque demonum auxilium poposcisse" (Liudprand's *Historia Ottonis*, in *Monum. German., Scriptores* III, 344). No doubt these were traditional oaths which meant nothing. In the early eleventh century one Vilgardus, a teacher in Ravenna, was encouraged in dreams to literary study by demons in the form of Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal, according to the monk Glaber's *Historiae*, and began to teach things contrary to the faith, "dictaque Poetarum per omnia credenda esse asserebat" (Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens*, X, 23). Whether he was a mere eccentric or a humanist born too early, he found many followers and was condemned as a heretic (cf. Comparetti, p. 93; Hortis, *Opere Latine di Boccaccio*, p. 190; Ozanam, *Documents inédits pour servir a l'Histoire Littéraire de l'Italie*, p. 10). There is plenty of fanciful or jolly acceptance of paganism as a reality by young clerks in the *Carmina Burana*, twelfth or thirteenth century; see Stuttgart *Literarischer Verein* (1847), XVI, 67–71, 124–25, 155–65, 190 (I have not seen *Die lat. Vagantenpoesie des 12. u. 13. Jh. als Kulturerscheinungen*, by H. Süssmilch (Leipzig, 1917), noticed in Herrig's *Archiv*, CXXXVIII, 277, which has a chapter on *Die Antike in der Vagantenpoesie*). There is some truth in Walter Pater's notion of an "earlier Renaissance," except that the Renascence spirit always exists when a certain stage of culture is reached; literary vigor and originality became vocal in the general forward movement of the thirteenth century. Early in the twelfth century the troubadour Duke Guilhem IX, of Aquitaine, has been said to have contemplated founding a religious order for the worship of Venus. But this seems to be a ludicrous misunderstanding of some wild talk of his recorded by the hostile William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Regum Angl.*, Book V, §439; Michaud, *Biogr. Universelle;* J. H. Smith, *Troubadours at Home*, II, 348). In 1169 the possibility of reviving the *Jovialis religio* could be used merely to point a gibe. Bishop Gilbert Foliot of London, in resisting the metropolitan authority of Becket, had maintained that the pagan arch-flamen had had his see at London, "dum Jovialis religio colebatur." John of Salisbury retorts in a letter to the Canterbury monks: "Et fortasse vir prudens et religiosus cultum Jovis instaurare disponit, ut, si alio modo archiepiscopari non potest, archiflaminis saltem nomen et titulum assequatur" (*Materials for the Hist. of Thomas Becket*, VII, 10, Rolls Ser., No. 67). For a similar case see H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind* (3d ed.), II, 153–54. In the fifteenth century at Rome Pomponio Leto and his little Academy scoffed at Christianity and affected a revival of paganism, with sacrifices, an altar to Romulus, and religious honors to the Genius of Rome. This was neither intended nor generally taken seriously, though it inevitably meant a loosening of the bonds of Christianity, and men later are said to have attributed to these festivals the beginning of the decline of faith. Ficino too, like the Averroists,

any alarming heresy or skepticism in fourteenth-century Italy or elsewhere before Wyclif. Most medieval heresies, being of mystical or superstitious character, could have little bearing on a cultivated liberalism or skepticism.[1] Though modern Italians speak of the "fundamental paganism of the Italian mind," this is not inconsistent with superficial orthodoxy, and complete infidelity was rare, even in Italy, at least till the late fifteenth century. The Catholic religion felt secure in the fourteenth century. But for all that, the medieval mind found in both authority and experience reason to fear peril to souls in non-Christian ideas of the supernatural, and (as will appear) in the frivolous morality supposed to go with them. In St. Paul's epistles and other parts of the New Testament as well as in the Fathers and their successors, the pagan gods are execrated as demons rather than denied as myths. A sort of paganism maintained a real subterranean existence in the horrifying rites of necromancy (and to a less extent in astrology), which people knew and shuddered at; it was on the ground of religious honors to demons and creatures that necromancy was condemned, and that Jeanne d'Arc and other convicted magicians were executed. From the eleventh century on there were subversive tendencies of the liberal kind, especially in Italy, such as some of the scholastic nominalism, Averroism, the equivocating doctrine of the Twofold Truth, "Epicureanism," denial of immortality, all that is represented by the Emperor Frederick II,

---

reduced all religions to one level, and regarded worship of the gods as worship of God, not of demons. See Creighton, *History of the Papacy* (London, 1882–94), III, 40–44; H. C. Lea, *History of Inquis. of Middle Ages* (New York, 1906), III, 570, 571; *Dublin Rev.*, CXVII, 318. Coluccio Salutati asked one Giuliano Zennarini to buy him a Virgil, and was rebuked by him for desiring a heathen, a "vates mentificus"; Salutati inquires where is the harm in reading pagan poets, since the pest of paganism is dead forever and none could now revere its gods (Rösler, *Card. Joh. Dominici*, pp. 81–82). Such attempts to revive antiquity, on the political rather than the religious side, will be remembered as those of Arnold da Brescia in the twelfth century and Rienzi in the fourteenth, who, quoting Livy and others, tried to recall their countrymen to the republican patriotism of Cato and Fabius; but only enthusiasts took such things seriously. On supposed paganism in sixteenth-century France cf. Lemonnier, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, V (Part 2), 284.

[1] Charles Dejob, *La foi religieuse en Italie au quatorzième siècle* (Paris, 1906); Felice Tocco, *L'eresia nel medio evo* (Florence, 1884), pp. 18, 31, 70, 71; H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind*, II, 313; H. D. Sedgwick, *Italy in the Thirteenth Century* (Boston, 1912), pp. 36–47, 372, etc.; H. B. Cotterill, *Medieval Italy* (London, 1915), Part V, chap. i; Émile Gebhart, *Les origines de la Renaissance en Italie* (Paris, 1879), pp. 57, 68, 76, 81, 82, 195; R. Bonfadini and others, *La vita italiana nel trecento* (Milan, 1895)

Farinata degli Uberti, Cavalcante, and the Cardinal degli Ubaldini and others.[1] Among signs that the Christian explanation had not permeated everything are such survivals of paganism as popular irreligious fatalism,[2] and such revivals of it as the literary cult of Fortune as a goddess.[3] In England of Chaucer's day we find rich people scoffing against the Trinity.[4] And at the very time when the *Troilus* was being written came the most threatening attack which the Latin church had suffered since the Albigensian heresies, from Wyclif's theological and anticlerical innovations. On the whole, what would tend to weaken the supremacy of traditional Christianity, the feeling that it was the only rational and civilized faith, unnoticed by the superficial, would displease some of the intelligent and earnest. Paganism to fourteenth-century people would not seem as dead as to us, partly because medieval religious conceptions differed less than modern from ancient conceptions. If less understood than with us, for that very reason when presented as an actuality, paganism would seem more startling; in the dark

[1] *Inferno*, X; Grandgent refers to the *Giornale Dantesco*, VIII, 170; *Decameron*, VI, 9; Renan, *Averroès et l'Averroïsme* (Paris, later edition), pp. 282–84, 292, 318, 331, 334, 335, 365, 425; Gebhart, *Origines de la Renaissance;* F. A. Lange, *Geschichte des Materialismus* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 156, 182, 187; W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of the Rise and Infl. of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (New York, 1866), I, 250; H. Reuter, *Gesch. d. religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1875), Vol. II; A. D. White, *Warfare of Science with Theology* (New York, 1919); F. W. Bussell, *Religious Thought and Heresy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1918), pp. 720, 722, 760; Erdmann, *History of Philosophy* (Eng. trans.), I 384; Hallam, *History of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1865), III, 366; (less important) J. W. Draper, *Intellectual Development of Europe* and *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science.* Boccaccio's story of the Jew Melchisedech and the three rings (*Decam.*, I, 3) has been wearisomely misused in this connection, even by Renan; it is merely a clever evasion from a hard quandary. But Averroism did tend to the view that one religion is as good as another.

[2] Thomas Usk, *Testament of Love* (Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, VII); Arturo Graf, *La credenza nella fatalità* (in *Miti, leggende e superstizioni del med. evo*, I, 273–301; also in *Nuova Antologia*, June, 1890).

[3] *Roman de la Rose*, 6179–86 (Raison rebukes L'Amant for making Fortune a goddess and exalting her to the heavens). Dante, though using pagan language, tries to Christianize the idea (*Inf.*, VII, 87). See B. L. Jefferson's excellent dissertation, *Chaucer and the Consolation of Philosophy of Boethius* (Princeton, 1917), chap ii. On this subject it is interesting to compare Montaigne's *Essays*, I, 56. On other kinds of literary paganism see Ozanam, *Documents inédits pour servir a l'Hist. litt. de l'Italie*, pp. 19 ff., 28, 68.

[4] *Piers Plowman*, B, X, 51–112. In Deschamps and Gower (*S.A.T.F.*, VI, Nos. 1167, 1222; *Mirour de l'Omme*, 25909–20) we find wails over the decline of faith as shown by materialism and laxity in conduct. Elsewhere in these writers we find such jeremiads, exaggerated sometimes by their temperaments. Some earnest souls in the two centuries especially before the Reformation and counter-Reformation felt a hollowness in religion. But it was a coldness rather than a skepticism.

every bush may seem a bear. A revival of paganism, though improbable, was thinkable to a medieval. If these are fair statements, they may well form part of the background for picturing the reaction in Italy and even in England to poetry which substituted the pagan for the Christian view of the world.

There is no lack of material for summarizing the medieval attitude toward classical poetry.[1] The general attitude held by Christians from ancient times to the fourteenth century had varied with circumstance and temperament rather than with epoch. As Christianity became more firmly established, there was less opposition, but little that was new was said on the subject. Classic poetry was not only an essential part of "Grammar," the first study in the Trivium. It was read everywhere and all the time, to a varying extent, for pleasure. The rigid and the ignorant had censured it as irreligious and immoral; the liberal and cultivated, from the Fathers down, had read it really, no doubt, for its interest and beauty, but had professed to value it for a supposed esoteric meaning and its help in interpreting the language and allusions of ecclesiastical writers, and had explained away what is anti-Christian in it. The fifteenth century no doubt expressed much that was under the surface in the late fourteenth. Its avowed principles, though intensified both ways as humanism advanced, did not differ greatly.[2]

[1] Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages* (London, 1895), pp. 79–94, etc.; Hortis, *Opere latine di Boccaccio*, pp. 155–227; Taylor, *Mediaeval Mind*, II, 142–43, 159 ff., 168, 383, and in general chap. xxxi; F. A. Specht, *Gesch. d. Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1885), sec. 2, chap. i, pp. 45, 48, 51; *Hist. litt. de la France*, XIV, 113; R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of Med. Thought* (1884), and article on John of Salisbury in the *D.N.B.*; A. H. L. Heeren, *Gesch. d. classischen Litt. im Mittelalter* (Göttingen, 1822); J. E. Spingarn, *Lit. Crit. in the Ren.*, chap. i; Guido delle Colonne, *Historia Trojana* (Strassburg, 1489), sig.E4vo, I3ro; John of Salisbury, *Metalogicus*, I, 2, and especially 22; Richard of Bury, *Philobiblon*, chap. xiii ("Quare non omnino negleximus fabulas poetarum"; he quotes Bede to the same effect); St. Gregory, *Epist.*, xi, 54 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, LXXVII, 1171); St. Basil the Great, Πρὸς τοὺς νεοὺς, ὅπως ἂν ἐξ Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῖντο λόγων (Migne, *Patr. Graeca*, XXXI, 564 ff.). The attitude of caution or hostility toward classical poetry had merely been intensified by the Christians from that of pagan moralists; as for instance in Plutarch's Πῶς δεῖ τὸν νεὸν ποιημάτων ἀκούειν (Wyttenbach's ed., Vol. I, Part I), and of course Plato's *Republic*, Book x. During the twelfth century many writers are said to have objected to and themselves abandoned the study of the classics (Sandys, *Hist. Class. Schol.*, I, 594–96; Hortis, *Op. lat. di. Bocc.*, pp. 212). Most modern writers content themselves with discussing the attitude of the Fathers; little is collected on the attitude of the Middle Ages. The best modern writers are Comparetti, Hortis, and Taylor. Spingarn's *Criticism in the Renaissance* tends to minimize the continuity of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. See also St. Augustine, *Confess.*, I, 16; and Saintsbury, *Hist. of Criticism*, I, 378 ff.

[2] *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati* (ed. F. Novati; Rome, 1893 ff., Vols. XV–XIX of the publications of the Istituto Storico Italiano), III, 221 ff., 230, 539 ff.; IV, 170 ff., 205 ff.,

The freshened interest in Greek and Roman writers was not a genuine revival of Hellenism; uncritical mysticism was rife as ever, as we see in Ficino and Pico della Mirandola. People read ancient poetry, as they had always done, because they liked it; attack and defense were prosecuted on much the same avowed grounds of impiety, viciousness, and worldliness, of allegorical and historical edification. Yet, as a critic has said, some students believed that in their day was rising the very same sun which had set at the fall of Roman culture. It is not surprising that churchmen took an attitude of hostility, for the classical revival seemed to contradict the fundamentals of their morality and was destined to destroy the theory of a theocracy and undo the work of the early church. At bottom there was a change which threatened faith and morals. The early humanists did not attack the church, but some of them became estranged. Even at the first, admirers of the classics often took pains to imply or state their Catholic orthodoxy,[1] which implies that others were suspicious of it.

To draw back nearer to Chaucer, Petrarch and Boccaccio did not free themselves from the tendency to interpret mythology by euhemerizing and allegorizing. Herein they were sincere; it was also the best way to win toleration for their studies. None the less they were innovators. Both sincere Catholics, beyond any

---

231; *Scelta di Curiosità*, LXXX; M. G. Dominici, *Lucula Noctis* (ed. R. Coulon; Paris, 1908; from this first important attack on humanism Rösler quotes the sentiment, "Utilius est Christianis terram arare, quam gentilium intendere libris"); Aug. Rösler, *Cardinal Johannes Dominici* (Freiburg, 1893), pp. 64–101; J. H. Robinson, *The New History*, pp. 116–17; Geiger, *Renaissance u. Humanismus; Historische Zeitschrift*, XXXVIII, 193 ff.; Schück, *Zur Characteristik d. Ital. Humanisten d. 14. u. 15. Jh.* (Breslau, 1857); Voigt, *Wiederbelebung d. class. Alterthums* (Berlin, 1893), I, 6–8; II, 213, 467, 469; J. C. Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (tr. Middlemore); J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy;* Sandys, *Hist. of Class. Schol.;* other works cited earlier. On the attitude of the regular clergy see Comparetti's references, p. 85, Richard of Bury's *Philobiblon*, chap. vi, and Taylor, *Mediaeval Mind*, II, 426. As early as 1399–1406 a vigorous controversy as to the religious and moral effects of classical study was carried on between Coluccio Salutati on the humanist side and such men as Giovanni di Samminiato and Giovanni Dominici on the side of the regulars (see *Epistolario* and Rösler's book above).

[1] Salutati and Boccaccio did so. Carlo Malatesta (1385–1429), Lord of Rimini, an admirer of antiquity, said to have modeled his conduct after ancient heroes, so far shifted his sympathies as to overthrow a statue of Virgil at Mantua, on the ground that images were for the saints, not the poets, above all pagan poets—"Histriones," he calls them. "Sed in primis novum Religionis genus vide, immo verò Superstitionis. Sanctis deberi Status, ait; Poetis negat; atque huic minûs, quòd Gentilis fuerit," writes the eminent humanist Vergerio with amazement (L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Scriptores* [Milan, 1730], XVI, 217–19).

man for many centuries before they endeavored to understand the ancients as they were. They formed a Concordat between the Catholic faith and classical scholarship which lasted five hundred years and, indeed, has not been revoked yet; but it was by no means understood or approved of in their day, especially by the clergy and members of other learned professions. Petrarch's admiration for Virgil is well known to have led in 1352 to an accusation of the study of magic from a cardinal.[1] The physician against whom Petrarch inveighed attacked poets as hostile to the true faith and to be shunned by the faithful.[2] Boccaccio seems to have suffered more than Petrarch. He was also less consistent, stable, and philosophical in his views; superficially Christian, essentially pagan, believing himself a thorough Catholic but with a deeper sympathy for antiquity. The folk of Certaldo at the close of his life thought him a sorcerer, who held commerce with the devil.[3] Holding the same suspicions as those held by the cardinal against Petrarch, no doubt they too were misled by Boccaccio's studies.

In this connection far the most interesting of his works is the *De Genealogia Deorum*. Begun between 1340 and 1350 and probably published in 1371,[4] it was the earliest purely scholarly product of the Italian Renascence, practically the earliest encyclopedia or

[1] *Litt. Sen.*, I, 2 and 4 (1 and 3 in ed. of 1554); *Litt. Famil.*, IX, 5 (ed. Fracassetti, II, 18–19). This was once said to be Cardinal Alberti, but is now thought to have been Cardinal Pierre del Prat, bishop of Palestrina and vice-chancellor of the Roman church; see *Romania*, XXXI, 608–9, and C. Segrè in *Scritti vari di filologia*, addressed to Ernesto Monaci (Rome, 1901), pp. 387–98.

[2] *Invectio contra Medicum* III, 1205, 1215. On Petrarch's attitude cf. Corazzini, *Lettere edite ed inedite di Messer G.B.* (Florence, 1877), p. 338; *Epist. Famil.*, X, 4, to his monk-brother Gerardo; G. C. Parolari's *Della Religiosità di F.P.* (Bassano, 1847) is worthless, and F. Biondolillo's *Per la religiosità di F.P.* (Rome, 1913, from *Rivista di studi religiosi*) is little better. Petrarch's active hostility to medical and other medieval learning doubtless partly accounts for the attacks on him.

[3] Hauvette, *Boccace*, pp. 464–65. On his attitude to religion and superstition cf. A. Graf, *Miti, Leggende e Superstizioni del Medio Evo*, II, 169–95, and references there; also Hortis, p. 206. The warning from the dying religious Pietro Petroni brought him by one Joachim dwelt chiefly on the lasciviousness of his early works, but warned him to give up his "poetica studia" and abjure "exitialem poeticen illam" (*Acta Sanctorum*, 29 May, Book III, chap. xi; the source seems to be Petrarch's well-known letter, *Epist. Sen.* I. 5 [4 in 1554 edition]; Hauvette, *Boccace*, pp. 367–68). Does not Professor Courthope overestimate the injury to Boccaccio's reputation (*History of English Poetry*, I, 263)?

[4] Hauvette (*Boccace*, pp. 414, 447) and recently E. H. Wilkins (*Mod. Phil.*, XVII, 425) believe it was toward the end of Boccaccio's journey to Naples in 1370–71 that copies of the work began to be made; Hortis (pp. 158, 286, 291–93) says not before 1373. See also Corazzini, *Lettere edite ed inedite*, pp. 350–53.

handbook of classical mythology,[1] and does honor to Boccaccio's versatility, learning, and disinterested zeal. Its last two books form the earliest of the numerous Renascence Defences of Poetry.[2] Clearly Boccaccio not only apprehended attacks upon ancient poetry and himself, but had experienced them. He was not merely answering the objections of early Christian writers; a man does not dig up buried enemies. "Agam igitur quod potero, iuuante deo, ne omnino temerarie uideatur [liber meus] egisse quod fecerit. Ipse [deus] me eripiat de faucibus malignantium" (XV prooemium, p. 385). Many have attacked the study of ancient poetry because of the frivolity and worse in the tales of the gods (XIV, 14, p. 372). After rebutting various attacks and defending poetry on various grounds, he comes at last to the attitude a Christian should take toward the classical poets. It cannot be wrong, he opines, to treat of the superstitions of the Gentiles and their nefarious rites, for if it were, our most holy mother-church would have forbidden it by a perpetual decree (XV, 9, p. 393, and XIV, 18, p. 376). That all the gods of the nations are demons had been shown him by the psalmist[3] and had been most familiar to him from his tender years, and therefore their silly crimes had been displeasing; yet aside from the matter of religion the manners and writings of certain poets have given pleasure (XV, 9, p. 395). At the end of the *apologia* he becomes more and more conciliatory. He will not deny that it may be well for a boy to abstain from such reading

[1] Hauvette (*Boccace*, pp. 413–30, 446); Hortis, *Opere Latine*, pp. 172–99, 202 ff., 525–42; Voigt, *Wiederbelebung d. Class. Alt.*, I, 169; II, 213, 469; Koerting, *Boccaccios Leben u. Werke*, p. 722; Grandgent, *Dante* (New York, 1916), p. 226. Hortis (pp. 525 ff.) discusses and reprints two earlier contemporary mythological genealogies (very brief) by Paolo da Perugia and by Franceschino degli Albizzi and Forese dei Donati, all of whom probably belonged to the circle of Petrarch and Boccaccio. Summaries and the like were common in the Middle Ages, but no such recognition of mythology as something worth mastering is known to have preceded. The production of three, to say nothing of Paolo's lost "Liber Collectionum," about the same time in the same circle shows how fast the ferment worked. Boccaccio's letter about the *De Genealogia* to Pietro da Monteforte is in Corazzini, *Lettre edite ed inedite*, pp. 350–53. I cite the *De Genealogia* from the edition of Basle (1532); Books XIV and XV are printed from a revised autograph MS in O. Hecker's *Boccaccio-Funde* (Braunschweig, 1902), pp. 188 ff. One of the early writers named Fulgentius wrote a "Mitologiae," full of allegorical interpretations (*Opera*, Leipzig, 1898; Saintsbury, *Hist. of Criticism*, I, 393).

[2] See E. Woodbridge in *PMLA*, XIII, 333–49; and Saintsbury, *Hist. of Criticism*, I, 460 ff. Boccaccio wrote a shorter defense of the same sort in the *Comento sopra la Commedia*, pp. 123–36, on *Inf.* I, 73.

[3] The same in *Comento sopra la Commedia*, *Inf.* I, 72 (Florence, 1863, p. 123).

till he is fully enough acquainted with the Christian religion (XV, 9, p. 393).[1] He often uses such phrases as *gentilium stultitias, deorum gentilium nugas* (XV, 9, p. 395). If he, a Christian man, has treated of the stupidities of the Gentiles, he has done it at the behest of his royal patron, and in detestation of their erroneous credulity (*ibid.*). The shames of the gentile gods are buried and damned forever, and if he, a Christian man, has tried to bury them more deeply [*sic*] he deserves praise, not criticism (XV, 11, p. 398).[2] Nothing can shake his Christian faith, and he sets forth the articles of his belief at much length (XV, 9, p. 395). Thus the early Renascence bowed at the altar of Rome and said its *Confiteor* and *Credo*. No doubt the attacks were due to mixed motives. Partly they were the mere floutings of those who had no interest in this learning and perhaps disliked Boccaccio; partly they may have been due to jealousy of what was promising to be a new learned profession on the part of members of the old ones, theology, medicine, and law. But they were mainly due to an intensified sense of the peril to faith and morals from an intensified study of ancient poetry. Even Boccaccio's friend Pietro da Monteforte, one of the first to see the *De Genealogia*, wrote in a manner which showed he felt the book alien or hostile to religion. Boccaccio replies that he does not deny the book is foreign to Christianity, but calls attention to the fact that it *in detestationem gentilitiae superstitionis exclamat.*[3] The length, the sophistry and conciliatory spirit[4] of

[1] The place of ancient poetry in the education of the young had been discussed for centuries. See works by Plutarch and St. Basil cited above; Specht, *Gesch. d. Unterrichtswesens*, pp. 45, 48, 51; Comparetti, p. 91; also Coluccio Salutati, *Epistolario*, IV, 205 ff.

[2] Cf. a citation from Coluccio Salutati above, and Rösler's *Card. Joh. Dominici*, p. 82, and Richard de Bury's *Philobiblon*, chap. xiii.

[3] Corazzini, *Lettere*, p. 353.

[4] Unlike Petrarch he is apt to be apologetic about his scholarly works. He wrote his encyclopedia of geography (*De Montibus*, etc.) to keep himself from idleness, he says, as writers of saints' legends say of their works (cf. *Sec. Nun's Prol.*, 22 ff.); a stock apology, made for instance by the tenth- or eleventh-century copyist of a manuscript of Virgil in the Vatican (No. 1570; Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, p. 95). But the conciliation in the *De Genealogia* is far more marked. The convention that edifying works were composed or copied to avoid idleness probably derived from monastic *scriptoria*. Writing was allowed as a substitute for other manual labor, which was a chief requirement of St. Benedict, laid down in his *Regula*, cap. XLVIII. This begins *Otiositas inimica est animae, et ideo certis temporibus occupari debent fratres in labore manuum* (ed. Woelfflin [Leipzig, 1895]; cf. Putnam, *Books and their Makers during M.A.*, I, 28 ff.)

these two books of *apologia* for his interests and for himself prove it was very expedient to head off trouble by defining his attitude.

All this bears in two ways on the subject. In the first place, more clearly than ever, pagan poetry was suspect on both religious and moral grounds, and a sympathetic and full acceptance of it was not so general that the complete adoption of paganism and the complete ignoring of Christianity for the first time in a realistic poem by a contemporary would not be startling or even worse to some of its readers.[1] Everyone would feel an astonishing novelty, some perhaps a tendency to irreligion and immorality. When Chaucer wrote the *Troilus* he was fresh from Italy and may have been aware by hearsay of the suspicion and debate occasioned by the new zeal for the classics. There is no reason for believing that his reputation for orthodoxy was or became frail.[2] But he was twice later to show himself on his guard much as he does here. In the *Franklin's Tale* he took pains to create an ancient atmosphere, and almost equal pains to disavow sympathy with it.[3] In the *Retractions* at the end of the *Parson's Tale*, in a tone much like that

[1] I have mentioned (p. 642) something similar in Benoit's partial acceptance of paganism in his poem, and Guido's counterblasts.

[2] There is some reason to think that later Chaucer sympathized with some of Wyclif's views, though he revealed the fact only by innuendo (*Mod. Phil.*, XIV, 257 ff.). It looks as if in another respect Chaucer's intentions in the *Troilus* had been taken amiss, perhaps not seriously. In contrast with the praise of woman and love almost petrified in fourteenth-century genteel poetry, the contrary tendency of the *Troilus* had disturbed some persons' sensibilities. Hence not only the excuses and amends in the *Legend of Good Women*, but also such chaffing disavowals of woman-hating as *N.P.T.*, 4450–56; *Manc. T.*, 187–95.

[3] In this latter case it is what he represents as ancient magic that he discountenances. Moreover, twice in the *Legend of Dido*, taken from Virgil's *Aeneid*, after quoting an example of the power of the pagan gods, he makes a point of expressing doubt or skepticism about it. When Aeneas had entered the Carthaginian cathedral ("maister temple"),

> I can nat seyn if that hit be possible,
> But Venus hadde him maked invisible—
> Thus seith the book, with-outen any lees [*L.G.W.*, 1020–22].

Our author, says Chaucer, tells that Cupid had taken the form of Ascanius,

> but, as of that scripture,
> Be as be may, I make of hit no cure [1144–45];

at any rate, he concludes, the fact is that Dido made much of the child. Dr. Lounsbury, in his distinguished *Studies in Chaucer*, opined that in such passages we find a man in advance of his age anxious lest he be sometime despised by the intelligent for credulity. I suspect that what Chaucer is disclaiming is credulity merely in regard to pagan miracles. Having bespoken credence for old books in his prologue, glorified Virgil at the beginning of this legend, and just told of Venus' transformation and vanishing (998–1001, and cf. 2249–52), he wished to make it plain that he did not take Virgil over-seriously. Ordinarily, as Chaucer knew very well, no reader would have bothered to consider whether Chaucer believed Virgil or not, but would have accepted the marvel as merely part of the story. So here again Chaucer seems curiously cautious.

at the end of the *Troilus*, he disavows his best works (including "the book of Troilus") as "worldly vanities,"[1] the very phrase he had used in the latter (V, 1837). There is abundant evidence that Chaucer often took precautions against misunderstanding. This excellent example I shall follow. I do not suggest that he made amends for the pagan *Troilus* lest the archdeacon should have him up before his court, or the abbot of Westminster should cross himself as he passed him; or even lest he be questioned by his confessor, or lest when he ceased to read an ominous silence should fall on the room, or a look of distress appear on the faces of good women. Chaucer, once more, felt the extraordinary novelty of his complete substitution of paganism for Christianity and its view of the universe.[2] He himself may have felt the chill of this alien

[1] Not, of course, on the specified ground of paganism, but implying rather worldliness and voluptuousness. To the list of precedents for Chaucer's *Retractions* (cf. *PMLA*, XXVIII, 521–29) should be added those near the end of the prologue to Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Universale* (Strassburg, 1473?). Cap. xviii. is called *Retractio prime partis* (viz., the *Speculum naturale*), cap. xix. is called *Retractio secunde tercie & quarte partis* (viz., the *Speculum Doctrinale*, *Morale*, and *Historiale*). Toward the end of cap. xix. and in cap. xxi. he uses the form *retractatio*, but the weight of his testimony is for the shorter form. In these *Retractiones* he reviews his works, justifies them or apologizes for their shortcomings, gives reasons for this or that, and states his estimate of them. He is clearly following the model or the traditional example of St. Augustine's *Retractationes*. If we need look for any one precedent for Chaucer's, Vincent's example is the most obvious to select among those noticed, though he does not use the plural form as Chaucer does. Note also the use of *retracter* in the passage from Deguilleville's *Pèlerinage* cited above. Pope Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini) wrote a letter and in 1463 issued a bull of retractation for certain of his early views on general and ecclesiastical matters. He follows, he says, the example of St. Augustine in admitting his own shortcomings, which further indicates that St. Augustine started the tradition of writing retractions. See Voigt, *Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini* (Berlin, 1863), III, 574–75; W. Boulting, *Aeneas Silvius* (London, 1908), pp. 179–81; M. Creighton, *History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome*, II, 478–79, and *Historical Essays and Reviews* (London, 1903), p. 61. On the word *retractatio*, compare E. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, IV, 282.

[2] When all is said and done, there is not much in the poem about pagan rites or about the gods as moving forces. The moving force behind it all is destiny, an idea familiar to the medieval. But on the surface paganism is everywhere and Christianity is gone. He disavows more than there is to disavow, because he is heading off not an indictment but a feeling. The fact that the poem professed to be translated from the Latin of Lollius would make no difference. His friends would know it was not, and others would expect medievalizing if it were. I pointed out (p. 627 above) that the devotional final stanza is unusual, without some special reason, in such a poem. One thing more in this connection: Chaucer retracts the worldly vanity of passionate love and pagans' cursed old rites in the form of old clerks' speech. In the next stanza he begs correction from "moral Gower," a poet of love and of edification, and from "the philosophical Strode," a theologian. (Just so Boccaccio in the conclusion of the *De Casibus*, pp. 633–34 above, begs Petrarch to emend what does not agree with Christian religion and philosophical truth; see also the dedication.) The thought cannot but suggest itself that the epithets were chosen with reference to the two parts of the retraction, on the passion

and calamitous world in which he had lived so intensely, and comes home to the warmth and glory of his own faith. Even at some sacrifice of art he wished to effect a makeshift unification of his poem with everything else in his friends' minds and his own, that it should not be encysted, as it were, by itself. He wished unreserved acceptance of it, not checked by unessential queries and sense of strangeness; to domesticate it by ending on a familiar though discordant note.

Secondly, no one can fail to see how curiously Chaucer's short and emphatic disowning of paganism and giving of his *credo* (1842 ff., 1860 ff.) are paralleled at the end of Boccaccio's *De Genealogia*. Whether or not it was here that he got the mythology so profusely used in the *Troilus*, there is good reason to believe he knew the work later, when he wrote the *Legend of Good Women*.[1] His conduct is intelligible enough without any suggestion from Boccaccio. But it is not impossible that he wished, besides domesticating the

---

and the paganism. There is more than idle compliment in the address to them, it is no mere dedication, and the epithets are not meant as chaff, as some have fancied. Chaucer never elsewhere put in such a personal request. Ralph Strode as a theologian seems to have been a thorough conservative, who fought Wyclif's doctrine of predestination as inconsistent with man's free will. Even before Chaucer had inserted Troilus' long soliloquy on free will in the later version, the latter part of his poem was pervaded with capricious Fortune and inevitable Destiny. Strode would have been an uncompromising critic.

[1] C. G. Child in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XI, 476–90; Skeat, III, xxxix f.; Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 232–33. The only parallel found for Chaucer's "heed of verre," "howve to glase" (*T.C.*, II, 867; V, 469), "vitremyte" (*Monk's T.*, 3562), is the "galea vitrea" in *De Genealogia Deorum*, XIV, 18; see *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXI, 62. But it is doubtful if this is the only source. The work is likely enough to have been one of the "sixty bokys" (*L.G.W.*, Prol. A, 273) in his own library. Copies of so large a work cannot have multiplied rapidly. If it should prove that Chaucer knew it before his second journey to Italy in 1378, either it must have reached him in England, or he must have had unusual opportunities for securing Boccaccio's works, to have got hold of this one within two years after 1371, when it apparently began to be copied. One thing more: this paper was by no means begun or continued with the purpose of establishing further connections between Chaucer and Boccaccio. But it is surprising how each road led toward him, the "Go little book," the request for criticism, the retraction. Dr. H. M. Cummings has undertaken to appraise the amount of Chaucer's obligations to Boccaccio's Italian works (*Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio, University of Cincinnati Studies*, 1916). The study was well worth making, its assembling of fact and opinion is of service, and it contains many good detailed observations. But its conclusions are weakened by a curious failure at times to understand his predecessors, and also by a failure to appreciate the cumulative force of evidences singly small. A false impression, further, is given by limiting the field to Boccaccio's Italian works and disregarding those in Latin. Latin or vernacular, it's all one, and the more works by Boccaccio Chaucer knew, the greater the probability of his having known still others.

poem for the medieval mind, to ward off any such disapproval as Boccaccio and others clearly had faced.

In effect, the *Troilus* is the first deliberate "local color" narrative in English, just as the *Reeve's Tale* is the first dialect story. It is only natural that these innovations should proceed from the first and one of the greatest of English realists. Its utter novelty is enforced by the fact that while for generations it was one of the most popular of his works, it was scarcely ever imitated. One feels keenly what a stimulating intermediary between Chaucer and the classics was his first acquaintance with Boccaccio and Dante. As Professor Sandys says,[1] the chief aim of the later Italian Renascence was the imitation and reproduction of classical models of life and style. This is how the old poets wrote, says Chaucer, just after his renunciation of the gods and all their works—

> Lo here, the forme of olde clerkes speche
> In poetrye, if ye hir bokes seche.

In its abandonment to something new, the *Troilus* is more thoroughly in the spirit of the Italian Renascence than any of Chaucer's other works, more indeed than anything else in English before the sixteenth century, with its finish, its lyric manner, its psychological analysis, its abandonment to worldliness, its attempt to revive the past, and its doubt about doing so. On the whole, the ending is a return from the Renascence to the Middle Ages. In this article I have tried the difficult and subtle task of suggesting what it was in his own and his auditors' minds that led him to make the return. The attempt at background and at precision may unfortunately suggest something harder and more definite than the facts warrant. But it is difficult to doubt that the Epilog consciously reflects the age-long dispute as to the right attitude for a Christian man toward pagan poetry. Such a poem could have been written only when it was. Earlier it would not have been so classic, and later its classicism would not have been retracted. It remains unique even among Chaucer's own works. In his later poetry for some reason he apparently determined to disregard such niceties, and to introduce to his countrymen, so far as they were able to receive them, the more important traits which he had learned from the Trecentisti,

[1] *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, 1.

their combination of actuality with finish. Both had existed in English before, but hardly in combination. The variety and more exacting standards so learned made him both more enterprising and more critical when he later gave rein to his own personality. But unessentials he managed with a lighter touch. He never again took such pains to collect appropriate mythological details from far and wide,[1] or to make the reader feel that for the time he was living among the ancients. So far as Chaucer departed later from the Middle Ages it was not in a manner which was to be followed by the Renascence and its imitators, but in an original manner, which was to be followed by French and English literature in more modern times.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA

[1] This may quickly be verified in Skeat's *Index of Names*.

XVI

It is now in order to consider whether there is any internal evidence in *Sp* that points to a more or less immediate Irish source.

The plot of *Sp* relates a tale of strife between two clans. Perceval, his parents, his cousin Gawain, and his uncles King Arthur and the old man with nine sons, are members of one family or clan. Probably Lufamour and her followers were also related to this clan, because Perceval addresses them as "kynsmen" (1354). Four members of a hostile clan are: Gollerotherame, his giant brother, the Red Knight, and the Black Knight. The Black Knight was vassal to Golleratherame's brother (1959). The Red Knight is first named along with the Black Knight as if they were clansmen.[1] If this conjecture be admitted, all of the characters fit into one or the other of two hostile clans. Anyhow a strife between two clans, almost between two families, is sufficiently indicated.

Irish society was built up on the clan system, and Irish history is one long account of feuds between hostile families or clans. Of course Irish demi-gods or fairies, the creation of Irish imagination, conform to this social organization. The Second Battle of Moytura was fought between two semi-divine clans, the Túatha Dé Danaan and the Fomorians, and most of the Túatha are described as members of one family. This may be a *märchen* plot, but it is the kind of *märchen* that flourished vigorously in eleventh- and twelfth-century Ireland and Wales, but was uncommon in France or England, where the clan system was unknown. The plot of *Sp*, therefore, indicates a Celtic origin.

The passage in *Sp* (2013 f.) descriptive of the club with which the giant brother of Gollerotherame fights, strikes a note of grotesque and rather clumsy exaggeration which, in my judgment, is precisely like that sounded in the ancient Irish sagas. The club was made of

[1] Wolde he none forsake
The rede knyghte ne þe blake (50).

iron with a head of steel and weighed twenty-three "stone." The small men that are told of in stories today could "full evilly" fight with such a monstrous weapon (2018–33). All these points can be matched in descriptions of giants' clubs which were written in Irish before the twelfth century.[1]

The grotesque size of the club is paralleled in the *bachlach's* club in *Fled Bricrend* (§ 91) (ed. Henderson [1899], p. 116, from *LU*), which "would be a burden for twenty yoke of oxen"; and in the clubs of the "Manx giants" in *Dá Derga* (§ 130) (one of the oldest sagas, *Rev. Celt.*, XXII, 303, from *LU*), each of whom wielded "a long staff of iron as long and thick as a yoke."[2]

The iron material of the club is paralleled in the iron staves of the Manx giants; in the iron spit wielded in battle by MacCecht, a giant in *Dá Derga* (§§ 87, 148) (*Rev. Celt.*, XXII, 187, 318); and in the iron club carried by Fer Caile ("man of the wood"), a giant who had only one eye, one foot, and one hand, and who was accompanied by a wife with a similar weapon (*op. cit.* [§§ 38, 136], pp. 41, 309).[3]

Finally the statement about the small men of today which has just been quoted from *Sp* may hark back to the way in which Irish tales dwell upon a decline in stature since Finn's time. For example, in the *Acallam*, lines 61 f. (*Silva Gadelica*, II, 103), when some of the *Fíana* who have marvelously lived on for centuries appear to Patrick and his clergy, we read: "The clerics marvelled greatly . . . . for

[1] Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 110, observed the "odd description of the club" in *Sp*, and "hoped to find in it a clue," but he cautiously remarked: "The trouble with any giant's single combat is that it is very much like every other one: all have been conventionalized." Griffith was, however, unfamiliar with Irish sagas.

[2] Compare (in documents that have not been proved so old, but which certainly preserve genuine Irish tradition) the Dagda's club, which as he dragged it along tore up a furrow in the earth that can be traced today, *Cath Maige Tured* (§ 93) (*Rev. Celt.*, XII, 87); and the club of the Gilla Decair (Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances*, pp. 223 f.).

[3] Compare, in later documents, the club of the Gilla Decair, which was of iron, as was that of a one-eyed giant in Diarmuid and Grainne, ed. O'Grady (1857), p. 120. Fer Caile, "the woodman," of *Dá Derga* is, as I have shown in *PMLA*, XX (1905), 683, a pan-Celtic figure. He is well known in Highland tales under the name of the *fáchan* (which is no doubt a diminutive of *fathach* "a giant," see Hyde, *Beside the Fire* [1910], p. xxii). Campbell, *Pop. Tales of the West Highlands*, IV, 298, has a woodcut of this one-legged, one-armed, and one-eyed giant. According to an Irish tale (Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. xxi), he "held a very thick iron flail-club." A similar figure in Welsh with but one foot and one eye (Loth, *Les Mab.* [1913], II, 9) "carried a massive iron club." The Fomorians are sometimes similarly described. This kind of giant, then, appears in Irish (and Highland) stories from the eighth century to the present day, and is mentioned in Welsh. I know of nothing exactly like him outside of Celtic territory. The cyclops resembled him in having one eye.

the largest man of them reached but to the waist or else to the shoulder" of the *Fíana*, even when the strangers were seated.[1]

The evidence for Irish origin rests upon the tone of this whole passage in *Sp*, rather than upon separate details, for they can probably all be matched in popular tales from non-Celtic lands.[2] It is not supposed that by itself this evidence proves much, but so far as it goes it harmonizes excellently with a hypothesis of Irish origin.

In view of the extraordinary changes to which proper names in the romances are subject, it is doubtless unsafe to attach importance to Perceval's "lyttill Scottes spere" (191, 195).[3] The epithet may go back to an older time when "Scottes" meant Irish, but we cannot be sure of this. More significant is the fact that this casting spear was used in battle. In *Sp* this dart was the sole thing among the father's belongings that the mother carried to the forest. The importance thus given to it seems to indicate that in a more primitive form of the story it must have been meant for use in battle. Certainly Perceval uses it both for hunting and for battle with the Red Knight.

The author of *Sp*, perhaps, understood that this spear was meant solely for hunting, and that its use in battle was a blunder of the boy Perceval; nevertheless it is curious that a romance writer should make prominent any pointed weapon except the great jousting spear which was the glory of chivalry. This dart or casting spear can be best explained as a survival from a prechivalric story that arose in the days when warriors fought with javelins on foot or from a chariot.[4] It points to a popular and probably to a Celtic source for the romance.

[1] The Celtic flavor of this combat gives some support to the conjecture expressed above, *Mod. Phil.*, XVIII, 221, that the name of the giant, Gollerotherame, should be explained as Irish. The first syllable of this preposterous and otherwise unexplained name (cf. Griffith, *Sir Perceval*, p. 91, n. 2; and Miss Weston, *From Ritual to Romance* [1919], p. 91, n. 2) is, as we have seen, the epithet applied to a giant who though sometimes a comrade was at first, and often, a foe and rival to Finn. It is a plausible conjecture that Goll, which meant in Irish first "blind" and then "one-eyed," was a stock epithet for fabulous one-eyed giants called Fomorians, one of whom called Balor was slain by Lug in the semi-mythological Battle of Moytura.

[2] E.g., in the story called "Short Shanks" a giant fights "with a thick iron club," Dasent, *Popular Tales from the Old Norse* (1859), p. 119.

[3] In the Bliocadrans *Prologue*, Perceval's mother says that she is going to Saint Brendan of Scotland: "A saint Brandain k'est en Escoce," ed. Potvin, 1071.

[4] The bleeding lance of the grail castle is likewise a javelin and assuredly not the jousting spear with its huge kettle-drum-like handle of the days of chivalry. See Wauchier, ed. Potvin, 20151 f.; Chrétien, 3154 f. This is evidence that the grail story is old traditional material and probably the oldest part of the Arthurian complex.

The marvelous elements in *Sp*, such as the "craftes" of the Red Knight (561, 608), his "wykkyde armour" (139) that evidently made him invulnerable to ordinary weapons, and the witch mother who could restore him to life, are the sort of thing that abounds in Irish and Welsh traditional tales. They would naturally be accounted for on the hypothesis of Irish origin, and would be explained as survivals from the lost source *X*.

The absence of such marvels from *M* is clearly due to a desire to present this story as part of the sober annals of Finn, and should lead nobody to suppose that *X* was without supernatural features. *A* shows the state of the matter very well. Indeed Finn's exploits were chiefly against giants and fairies, and the Finn cycle is shot through with marvelous elements.

Finn is in great part a mythological character. His mother was Muirenn, daughter of Tadg son of Nuada. Both Tadg and Nuada are called "wonderful druids,"[1] which is no doubt only a way of saying that they were demi-gods. They are well known as chieftains of the Túatha Dé Danaan.[2] Both dwelt in the fairy-knoll of Almu, and it can be no accident that Finn's chief dwelling-place according to tradition was upon this very knoll. Not only was Finn connected with the Túatha Dé on his mother's side; long before the twelfth century, perhaps as early as the seventh century, his pedigree was carried back on the father's side also to Nuada Necht.[3] Finn, although sometimes said to be of the *clann Gaileoin*,[4] is thus closely associated with, and related to, the fairy folk of ancient Ireland.

Alike in the *Acallam* and in *M*, Finn is contending against supernatural foes. The Grey One of Luachair who made off with the treasures of Cumall is clearly no earthly character. Irish and Scotch Finn tales which have been written down in modern times often assign a part resembling his in the plot to "Black Arky the Fisherman," who is a sorcerer and a kind of demi-god.[5]

[1] *Fotha Catha Cnucha*, ed. Windisch, p. 121.

[2] *Acallam*, line 5119; *Silva Gadelica*, II, 225; see J. MacNeill, *op. cit.*, xlv, lix.

[3] K. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. xvii. Nuada was certainly a demi-god, perhaps a kind of water-deity; see MacCulloch, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[4] J. MacNeill, *op. cit.*, p. liv.

[5] See the reference to "the black fisherman working at his tricks," pointed out by Nitze, *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), 367, note 1, from "The Rider of Grianaig, "Campbell, *Pop. Tales of West Highlands*, III, 24.

Alfred Nutt (*Folk and Hero Tales*, ed. MacInnes, notes, pp. 425 f.) thought that folk-tales about Finn which have been recently collected or are still current in Gaeldom

It is clear that internal evidence in *Sp* is favorable to the theory of an Irish origin for the plot. This evidence is by itself of small importance. It is valuable solely because it corroborates the conclusion of former sections that the source of *Sp*, several times removed, of course, was of Irish origin.

XVII

We have arrived at the conclusion that *Sp* and *M* come from a common source *X*, an Irish tale, which may or may not have had

---

preserve better, allowing for a few modernizations, the old folk-tale of Finn's boyhood than do the literary modifications of it like *M*, that were written down in or before the twelfth century. But since it is difficult to prove that Finn tales have persisted in Gaelic lands for a thousand years almost unaltered, I here relegate to a footnote all versions for which no literary testimony of the twelfth century or earlier exists.

An Irish lay of Finn's boyhood, edited and translated by J. MacNeill, *Duanaire Finn*, pp. 33, 133–34, assigns to Finn's *mumme* a prophetic or supernatural character, "Bodhmann foster-mother of valor (*muime in gairgidh*) carried that lad to a secret hill, in the hollow of a tall ivy-clad tree is nursed that noble Fian-leader. . . . . Until he is nine years old he continues to be fed by Bodhmann." "*Glais díge* (Stream of the Dike) was the first name given him." Later Bodhmann told King Conn that Finn was the fated hero who was to break Conn's *geasa*, and who "was fated not to be christened till he should see brave Conn." This story, like the Annals and the *Fotha Catha*, but unlike *M*, connects Finn with Conn.

J. F. Campbell (in his *Pop. Tales of the West Highlands* (1892), III, 348 *f.*) tells a Gaelic version of Finn's youth under the title "How the 'Een was set up": Black Arcan (Arcan dubh), a fisherman (p. 352), got possession of Cumhail's sword and slew Cumhail with it. Later the youth Finn fell in with Black Arcan and by tasting a trout that Arcan set him to cook learned that he had slain his father. Thereupon Finn slew Arcan and kept the sword. Other Gaelic versions are outlined by J. G. Campbell in his *The Fians* (1891), pp. 16 f. In all of these a Black Fisherman (*Arcai Dubh Iasgair*) is the slayer of Cumhail. The *mumme* who rears Finn is Cos Lurgann ("Speedy Foot"), a sister to Cumhail. Several versions tell how Finn got a magic sword, "Mac-an-Luin," from a wonder-working Ulster smith by the help of the smith's daughter. (This is evidently a variant of the episode of Finn's love affair with a smith's daughter in *M* [§ 15]).

A seventeenth-century story called "The Fight of Castle Cnoc" that connects Finn with Conn is told by Kennedy in his *Legendary Fictions of the Irish Celts* (1891), p. 191: King Conn took the honors from Cumhail and gave them to Crimthan, whereupon Cumhail made war. Conn summoned to his aid Goll mac Morna and "the Ulster chiefs, Achy of the Red Neck, Iomchy of the Red Arm, and the terrible warrior Liath Luachra, a chief disgraced by Cumhail. Goll was promised the command of the Fianna, and Liath Luachra the magic Corrbolg (Body defense) of Cumhail, and the Fisherman of the Boyne, who was accustomed to take in three draughts at the mouth of that yellow-valed ever-beautiful river, as many fishes as sufficed for a meal to all the forces of Cumhail." (This sentence evidently means that the talismans or marvelous belongings of Cumhail were divided up among his slayers. The *Corrbolg*, as appears from the Lays [J. MacNeill, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 118 *f.*], was not a piece of armor but a bag that contained Cumhail's arms. It is mentioned in *M* as taken by Liath Luachra. The Fisherman of the Boyne must be either Achy or Iomchy, and since he corresponds to Arcan Dubh of the Gaelic tales he is doubtless Achy. What talisman he received is not clear. Probably a magic net or caldron that would yield fish for an army.) Cumhail got with child Muirrean, daughter of the druid Tadg who lived in Almuin [Almu]. Tadg desired revenge on Cumhail and a battle was prepared. Cumhail sent a messenger to the *Sid* of Maev at Carmain (Wexford) for "the impenetrable coat-of-mail the Corrbolg, and the accompanying resistless jewel-hilted glaive and spear." (These are evidently Cumhail's arms). Tadg, however, stirred up a druidic fog so that the messenger did not get

Finn for hero, but which was certainly more or less immediately connected not only with *M* but with *A*, and the other forms of the Finn and the Goblin story. We are now in position to decide pretty well what *X* must have contained, and consequently we can examine in some detail how far our provisional reconstruction of a more primitive form of *Sp*, given in a previous number of *Modern Philology*, is supported by Irish evidence.

1. "The mother, Acheflour, was a *fée* who brought up her son in a forest beneath a lake, where *fées* were his sole companions."[1]

In *M* the two "women-warriors," *dá banféindig*, who reared Finn in the forest of Slieve-Bloom are plainly *fées*, although this may not have been clear to the compiler who put the Irish story

---

the arms. "Cumhail was obliged to content himself with the inferior arms furnished by Aoinè the presiding sîd-queen of Naas." Cumhail had a presentiment of ill. He sent his female-runner Boghmin to Almuin telling her to attend Muirrean diligently "and when my son is born flee away with him and let him be brought up in the most secret places you can find. Otherwise the wrathful Tadg will destroy him." Boghmin was obedient and "assisted by the sage woman Fiecal" (cf. Fiacail, Finn's uncle in the *Fotha Catha*) reared up the son of Cumhail in a cavern on the side of Slieve-Bloom. King Conn afterward saw the boy, and not knowing who he was, called him Finn, i.e., "the fair" (cf. the incident with the King of Bantry in *M* [§ 13]). See also J. F. Campbell, *Leabhar na Feinne* (1872), pp. 35 f. Lady Wilde, *Ancient Legends of Ireland* (1902), p. 85, says that Finn cooked a salmon for a one-eyed giant whom he slew.

Another version of Finn's boyhood is given by Curtin, *Myths and Folk-Lore of Ireland* (1906), pp. 204 f. A druid grandfather orders the boy to be "thrown out of the castle window into a loch to be drowned on the day of his birth." "The boy sank from sight; but after remaining for a while under the water he rose again to the surface, and came to land holding a live salmon in his hand." (This is pretty surely a rationalization of Finn's bringing up in Under-Wave-Land. Cf. a curious rationalization in the Tale of Manus: A [fairy] nurse threw the boy over a precipice. Later the gardener found young Manus "playing shinty on the shore below him with a gold club and a silver ball" and brought him home. See D. MacInnes, *Folk and Hero Tales* (1890), p. 343, and Nutt's note, p. 485.) The grandmother carried the boy off to a forest and reared him. The king named him "Finn," not recognizing him. He roasted a salmon for a one-eyed giant whom he dealt with as Ulysses did the Cyclops. This part has been influenced by the *Odyssey* but there must have been something in the tale here that made the narrator think of Ulysses, and this was probably precisely the fact that the giant fisherman was according to native Irish tradition a one-eyed monster. The king was building a castle but every night a goblin adversary burned it to the ground. The king promised his daughter to any man who would save the castle, and Finn undertook the task. He had to slay three fairy men and their witch mother who was the worst of all and who had power to restore her sons to life. This is obviously a variant of the episode of Finn and the Goblin in the *Acallam* but it is a more striking parallel to *Sp* because here the power of the witch mother to restore the dead is distinctly stated whereas it is only hinted in the *Acallam*. Cf. Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

An incident similar to that of Finn and the Goblin is in a tale called "The Knight of the Red Shield," Campbell, II, 485, "A head came in a flame of fire, and another head came singing. A fist was struck on the door of the mouth of the king, and a tooth was knocked out. . . . . The head did this three years after each other." Fire and magic song are the two powers of the goblin in the *Acallam*, and in the verses from *LU*.

[1] Quoted from *Modern Philology*, XVII, 382.

into its present form. The epithet *banféindig* is one used of supernatural women.[1] Their names indicate a supernatural character: *Bodbmal bandrui*, and "The Grey One of Luachair." *Bodb*, which means a "scald-crow," occurs as a name for three Irish battle goddesses. *Bandrai*, "druidess" or "sorceress," suggests an unearthly being, as does also the mysterious name "Grey One of Luachair." These two supernatural protectresses, or "*mummi*" as they are called, correspond to the mother Acheflour and the one maid who brought up Perceval in *Sp*,[2] and to the Damoisele du Lac and one maiden, in the *Prose Lancelot*.

That the sequestered forest in *M* where the *mummi* brought up Finn was originally located beneath the waters of a lake seems pretty clearly established by two passages in the twelfth-century poem of Gilla in Chomded: "Seven years Finn was in hard plight, Under Loch Ree he found fair help,"[3] and, "Finn's first race . . . . into Loch Corrib from Loch Ree."[4]

In view of this evidence certain details in *M*, which by themselves are trifling enough, may be survivals from an earlier form of the story in which Finn's boyhood dwelling was under a lake. His first adventure was to slay a duck upon a lake (§ 6). He subsequently drowned nine youths who were swimming in a lake (§ 11).

[1] Aife an other-world queen whom Cuchulinn fought is called *banfennid*, *Tochmarc Emire*, *Rev. Celt.*, XI, 450, l. 110; *Creidne banfennid* is an enemy to Aife in a story in *LL*, 318*c*, 23 (*Fianaigecht*, xii f.). These are the only occurrences of the word known to me. Boand the nymph of the river Boyne is in *Airne Fingein*, *Anecdota*, II, 2, called *banghalghaide* "woman-warrior"; an other-world queen named Coinchend is in *Echtra Airt*, Eriu, III (1907), 170, called *banghaisgedhach*, which has a similar meaning; Siomha, daughter of Corr Luirgneach, is, in "The Battle of Magh Leana," ed. O'Curry, *Celtic Society*, VI, 33 (1855), called a *badhb* and a *bann-gairgidheach* to the people of Goll mac Morna. In the *Táin Bó Cualnge* (ed. Windisch, 4168) Scathach is said to have been *mumme* to Cuchulinn and Ferdia. In *Cormac's Glossary* (*s.v.* Buanann) she is called "Muimme na fían," "foster-mother of warriors." . . . . "Buanann then means a good mother for teaching feats of arms to heroes." See *Fianaigecht*, x, n. 2.

[2] Long ago Nutt, *Folk-Lore Record*, IV (1881), 32, compared the bringing up of Perceval to that of St. George who was stolen and taught by a weird lady of the woods:

> "There the weird lady of the woods
> Had borne him far away,
> And train'd him up in feates of armes
> And every martial play."
>
> —Percy's *Reliques*, Ser. 3, Bk. III, No. 1.

[3] "Fo Loch Riach fúa[i]r findc[h]obair," *Fianaigecht*, pp. 46–47. Perhaps "Findchobair" is another name for Finn's foster-mother.

[4] "Sen Loch n-Orbsen o Loch Riach," *op. cit.*, pp. 46–47. Gilla in Chomded also says that *Glasdíc* was Finn's name "at the first"; the Lays give Finn's early name as "Glaisdíge," "Stream of the Dike," which looks like a reference to the land beneath the water from which the boy Finn came. However, Kuno Meyer does not adopt this translation of "Glasdíc" (*Zeitsch. f. Celt. Phil.*, VII [1910], 524).

We can now see that similar traces of an original subaqueous dwelling appear in *Sp*. The verse near the beginning of *Sp*, which was distasteful to Chaucer's innkeeper,

He dranke water of þe welle, 7

and which seems to a reader today as it did to Chaucer exasperatingly flat and trivial, is perhaps a distorted survival of once significant detail. Perceval spent his youth with the *fée* of a well or fountain, and lived beneath the clear water. A distinct statement that Acheflour lived in wells survives in our romance:

. . . his moder þat wes,
How scho levyde with þe gres
With more drynke and lesse
In welles, þer þay spryng. 1776

The author of *Sp*, of course, understood this to mean something rational, namely, that she drank water from wells and ate herbs. At the beginning of the next stanza, he alters the lines in this fashion:

Drynkes of welles, þer þay spryng,
And gresse etys with-owt lesyng;
Scho liffede with none othir thyng
In þe holtes hare. 1779

A palpable trace of the original home of Acheflour has here survived. Another trace is in the passage where Perceval found his mother at a well:

. . . . he come to a welle,
þer he was wonte for to duelle
And drynk take hym thare.
When he had dronken þat tyde,
Forthimare gan he glyde;
Than was he warre hym be-syde
Of þe lady so fre. 2212

2. "She kept the boy's name secret because, if it were known, he might be sought out and slain by dangerous foes. A war was in progress between *fées* and giants."

We have just seen[1] that the Irish stories with their machinery of a feud between two clans supply the only adequate reason for the namelessness of the hero in *Sp*, in Chrétien, and in the related romances.

[1] See *Modern Philology*, XVIII, 225.

3. "Only a destined hero, aided by the proper talismans, could deliver fairyland from the giants."

The idea of a destined hero underlies the ninth-century tale, "How Finn Obtained Knowledge and the Death of the Fairy Cúldub." Oisín and Caelte successively fail in the pursuit and then Finn attempts it with success. It is hinted at in *A*, for King Conn's city has been burned repeatedly by the goblin and the king makes a public offer of reward to anybody who will save Tara. Finn accepts the offer and succeeds. It is definitely stated in the seventeenth Lay of Finn,[1] and is a rather common motive in folk-tales. That the motive is clearly preserved in *Sp* the following speech of King Arthur witnesses:

> þer is no man apon lyfe,
> With swerde, spere, ne with knyfe,
> May stroye hym allan,
> Bot if it were sir Percyvell son,
> Who so wiste, where he ware done!
> The bokes says, þat he mon
> Venge his fader bane. 568[2]

4. "One of the talismans was the "Scottes spear," which had belonged to the hero's father and which the *fée* gave to her son. With this he slew the Red Knight."

In *A*, Fiacail's spear is certainly magical: "By its means also it was that Finn ever and always had all his fortune" (p. 145). In *M* the spear shows no magical qualities, yet it is emphasized in a way somewhat out of proportion to its apparent insignificance, as if it once meant more than it does now. The fairy folk know instantly that it is Fiacail's spear, and they call it "venomous" (§ 25). Moreover, the pains taken by Finn to recover the weapon, and Fiacail's remark to Finn, "Keep the spear with which thou hast done the

[1] Bodhmann said of Finn to King Conn: "He is the prophesied of old . . . . he it is that shall break your *geasa*. . . . . He was fated not to be christened till he should see brave Conn," J. MacNeill, *Dunaire Finn*, pp. 33, 134.

[2] According to the "Fate of the Children of Tuireann," Lug was likewise a destined hero and was brought up in fairy-land. Balor's wife says: "It is prophesied and foretold that when he [Lug] shall come to Ireland our power there shall end forever" (O'Curry, *Atlantis*, IV, 1870, 166). Lug came "with a radiance like the sun" (cf. "fair child"), and "with his foster-brothers the sons of Manannan from the Land of Promise" (*ibid.*, p. 162). The combat between Lug and Balor the one-eyed Fomorian giant, which is told of in the semi-mythical Battle of Moytura, was perhaps a prototype of Perceval's combat with the Red Knight. On the destined-hero theme see *Mod. Phil.*, XVI, 556.

famous deed" (§ 26), attach to it a certain importance. As has been noticed on an earlier page, Fiacail's spear was regarded as a talisman that had been handed down from generation to generation. The spear in *Sp* which Perceval derived from his father is naturally explained as a later development of this Irish tradition about a magic spear.

5. "Another was the ring, which he obtained by exchange from the Damsel of the Hall, and which rendered the wearer invulnerable."

In *Sp* the power of the ring is described: "Siche a vertue es in þe stane" (1858). The magic resided in the stone, and it is probable that the ring is an addition, since rings are not usual in Irish sagas. In the original of *Sp* the talisman was probably a brooch or some ruder object[1] for which the ring is a substitution. Anybody, however, who prefers to do so is free to regard the ring as an out and out invention of the English writer. It is not necessary for our argument to prove that all of the talismans in *Sp* came from *X*, but only that some of them did. Nor is it necessary to deny that the author of *Sp* or some of his immediate predecessors may have had considerable inventive ability.

6. "A third talisman was the armor of the Red Knight."

The "crimson and fringed mantle" which Finn wore in *A*, and which protected him from the fire cast by the goblin, is an analogue to this red armor. It is, however, quite differently introduced, being worn by the hero in his combat with the supernatural foe, instead of being worn by this foe, as in *Sp*, and afterward taken off and worn by the hero. This may be a change made by the author of *Sp*, but more probably it was already present in *X*. In *M* the Grey One of Luchair, who corresponds in some respects to the Red Knight, carried, at the time when Finn slew him, the *corrbolg*, or bag containing the marvellous belongings of Cumall. He therefore had possession of Cumall's armor, and may have been thought of as wearing it.

7. "The *fée* sent her son out for the express purpose of delivering her brother King Arthur from the power and enchantment of the giants."

[1] Compare the "brooch" snatched by Finn from a woman of a fairy-knoll in *M* (§ 28), and the ring and the brooch mentioned by Wolfram at the corresponding place, *Parzival*, 131, 16. On magic rings see *Romanic Review*, III (1912), 145, note.

That Finn sets out for the express purpose of slaying the goblin is, of course, in the Irish goblin stories perfectly clear. This vengeance motive is plain in *L*, and only slightly obscured in Wolfram. It has become obliterated in *Sp*, but its restoration is obviously necessary to make the plot comprehensible.

The enchantment motive, which is plain in the oldest Irish tales, is in part perfectly well kept in *Sp*. Just as Finn in *A* was subject to having his royal city of Tara burned every Hallowe'en by the goblin, so Arthur in *Sp* was subject to having his golden cup carried off every Christmastide by the Red Knight. It has been shown above[1] that the enchantment in *Sp* originally meant more than this. The best proof of this is King Arthur's notable speech:

> In my londe wot I no lordyng,
> Es worthy to be a knyghte. 1088[2]

This shows that some kind of a spell must have rested upon the king and his land (The Enchantment of Britain). This spell must have been in *X*.

8. "She controlled the action and, by means of an enchanted mare, directed the hero to the places where he could get the talismans: the ring and the armor, and thus kill all the giants. She contrives the deliverance of her brothers and herself from the giants, and she rewarded the hero with the hand of another *fée*, called Lufamour, who was her sister, or her ally."

That a fairy guardian is not mentioned in the oldest "Finn and the Goblin" tales occasions no surprise. These are mere fragments and present no elaborate account of the hero. *M*, the only version that relates Finn's boyhood, gives him two [fairy]-guardians (Bodhmall is named first), and makes it plain that they watch over him until the time that he goes into service with the King of Bantry. However, no control by Bodhmall over Finn's later career is here indicated, and the motive is likewise almost lacking in the *Macgnímrada Conculaind*.[3] To account for this we must remember that these stories are known to us only in a modified form as heroic

[1] See *Modern Philology*, XVII, 381.

[2] Cf. also 1061, 1073 f.

[3] Scathach foretells in detail Cuchulinn's future (*Rev. Celt.*, XI, 452; *Archaeological Rev.*, I, 303), which is perhaps all that a heroic saga could be expected to retain of an original control of the hero by a *fée*.

sagas, and are attached to historical or supposedly historical warriors. In these heroic sagas the valor of Finn or of Cuchulinn is the theme, and the hero's glory must not be dimmed as it would be if his exploits were shown to be controlled by an all-powerful *fée*. Her part in directing the action, therefore, drops into the background, and is either forgotten or merely hinted at.[1]

Several statements that Finn was watched over by a *fée* are to be found, although not in the stories that we have been studying. At the beginning of the *Acallam na Senórach*, Oisín and Cáilte visit the aged Cámha: "the woman-chief and woman-custodian that from the time when he was a boy until the day in which he died kept Finn son of Cumall safe."[2] The twelfth-century prose *Dindshenchas*[3] relates that when Finn was fighting a battle against the three sons of Eochaid of the Red Eyebrows, Sideng, a daughter of Mongan of the elf-mounds, brought him a magic weapon.[4]

Irish evidence as we see, therefore, furnishes plenty of support for our provisional reconstruction of *Sp*. This reconstruction may therefore be regarded with considerable confidence.

XVIII

It is clear that, although we have not found *X* the precise story from which *Sp* stands in a direct line of descent, we have found something decidedly close to it in *M* and in older Irish documents. A fortunate chance which has preserved to us seventh- and eighth-century fragmentary Irish tales has enabled us to begin our study of the development of the story, in a way, at the beginning and not to depend on hypothetical reconstruction.

[1] The Irish word *mumme* is evidence of the early importance of the foster-mother. For references on the general subject of "fosterage" see Hastings, *Encyclop. of Religion and Ethics*, s.v.

[2] Ed. Stokes, ll. 15–17. Whether Cámha ("crooked"?) is another name for Bodbmall I do not know. Since fairy women are called by many epithets this would be a plausible hypothesis.

[3] *Rev. Celt.*, XVI, 147 (§ 139). This is a striking parallel to a passage in the *Prose Lancelot* (*Vulgate Version*, III, 144–52), where a damsel messenger from the Dame du Lac at each crisis of a battle gave Lancelot a new shield; see *Mod. Phil.*, XVII, 374.

[4] On fairy control see Miss Paton, *Fairy Mythology*, pp. 167 f. A very ancient example occurs in the eighth-century *Airne Fingein* (*Romanic Review*, IX [1918], 33), where a *fée* Rothniamh (Wheel splendor) on every Hallowe'en tells Fingen the future; and where, when King Conn wished to get Fingen into his power, a druid warns the king: "That will not be easy, for there is a woman of the elf-mound who instructs him" [§ 14]).

Our investigation begins with seventh- and eighth-century Irish tales and with *M*, which is an Irish story of the twelfth century, and it ends with *Sp*, a fourteenth-century English romance. It is clear that the story of *Sp* is of Irish origin and passed in some way from Irish into English. The exact steps by which it made its way from Irish through Welsh[1] and French versions into English need not here be discussed. That it did make its way is certain. In calling the story Celtic I do not mean to assert that all of its elements or any of them actually originated on Celtic soil, but only that, whatever their origin before they reached their present form, they had been fashioned by the imagination of the Celts. Long before the earliest date at which a French Arthurian romance embodying the incidents existed or in reason could have existed they were already developed in Ireland. These main incidents in the Middle English *Sp* and in the associated Old French romances are therefore unquestionably of Celtic origin.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

[*To be continued*]

[1] Perceval's epithet "li gallois" indicates that the story passed through Welsh.

A NOTE ON *ROMEO AND JULIET*, II, i, 1–2

Can I go forward when my heart is here?
Turn back, dull earth, and find thy centre out.

The explanations of this passage given by the editors are hardly adequate. Furness' *Variorum* quotes the following from Clarke and Singer respectively:

Dull earth. Romeo's epithet for his small world of man, the earthlier portion of himself.

This seems to be one of the many instances of Shakespeare's apparent intuitive feeling for correcter scientific views than were current in his day. The idea suggested is of the earth—symbol of the earthly body—at its aphelion, or the point of its orbit most remote from the sun, returning to it by the force of gravitation to the common center of gravity.

Other commentators give no other comment of importance; yet the passage is not clear without further explanation.

Romeo is thinking of the theory that the center of the earth is the point of attraction for all heavy or earthy bodies, contrary to light or fiery bodies, which tend to move upward. If a hole should be driven through the center of the earth from circumference to circumference, any object dropped from either side would eventually come to rest at the center. It might be forcibly impelled beyond this center at first, but, if so, would be drawn back finally to this resting place. For Romeo, the center to which he is irresistibly attracted is Juliet; he starts to pass by the grounds of the Capulets where she is, but is drawn back to them.

That the theories as to the center of the earth given above were common property in the sixteenth century is shown by the following passages from Erasmus' "Problema," one of the *Colloquies*, given here in the translation by Bailey (ed. 1900), which furnish an excellent commentary on the lines of the play:

Curio: What then is the natural center of heavy Bodies? and on the other hand, of light Bodies?

Alphius: All heavy Things are by a natural Motion carried towards the Earth, and light Things towards Heaven: I do not speak of a violent or animal Motion. . . . .

Curio: If any God should bore thro' the Center of the Earth quite down to the Antipodes, in a perpendicular Line, and as Cosmographers use to represent the Situation of the Globe of the Earth, and a Stone were let fall into it, whither would it go?

Alphius: To the Center of the Earth; there all heavy Bodies rest. . . . . But a Stone, if it did pass the Center with so violent a Motion, would at first go more heavily, and return to the Center again, just as a Stone thrown up into the Air returns again to the Earth.

Curio: But returning back again by its natural Motion, and again recovering Force, it would go beyond the Center, and so the Stone would never rest.

Alphius: It would lie still at last by running beyond, and then running back again until it came to an Equilibrium. . . . .

Curio: But what is it that makes a Body heavy or light?

Alphius: That's a question fit for God to answer, why he made Fire the lightest of all Things, and Air next to that; the Earth the heaviest, and Water next to that. . . . .

Curio: Do you think, then, that whatsoever has most of a fiery Quality in it is lightest, and that which has most of an earthy Quality heaviest?

Alphius: You are right.

Romeo refers to himself deprecatingly as "dull earth," as being composed mainly of the dull, heavy element, instead of all four elements mixed in due proportion. Compare Prospero's "Thou earth," used of Caliban, and also *Richard III*, III, iv, 78, "Thou little better thing than earth." The words are not to be understood as referring to the globe, as Singer and others take it. This confusion has been caused largely by the word "thy," which seems to refer directly to "earth." What Romeo means by the phrase "thy centre" is "what is *for thee* the centre"; to *him* Juliet is the attraction toward which he is drawn as heavy, earthy bodies to the center of the globe.

Perhaps the nearest parallel to these lines to be found in Shakespeare is *Troilus and Cressida*, IV, ii, 109–11:

> But the strong base and building of my love
> Is as the very centre of the earth,
> Drawing all things to it.

JOHN D. REA

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation Prior to 1860. By Lucretia Van Tuyl Simmons. "University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature," No. 6. Madison, 1919. Pp. 202.

Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation Prior to 1860, by Lucretia Van Tuyl Simmons, is the result of the author's investigations while pursuing graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin, and is one of the several valuable contributions to German-English literary relations which have emanated from that institution.

As the author states, this is the first systematic effort to collect all of the evidence concerning Goethe's shorter poems in English translation, a considerable undertaking in itself, in view of the scattered and incomplete records, and in spite of the several investigations relating to the general reception of German literature in English-speaking countries. When all the material was collected, the work finally resolved itself into a bibliography and chronological treatment of all material which offers translations of Goethe's poems into English prior to 1860, and which indicates, incidentally, the general development of interest in Goethe in England and America.

Miss Simmons' rather complete bibliography and thorough discussion of the material at hand is an admirable contribution to a subject hitherto neglected, and will undoubtedly prove interesting and helpful to all students of Goethe, especially to those who are concerned with his recognition abroad. As she rightly points out, Goethe as a great lyric poet is not known and cannot be appreciated if the public depends upon the translation of the finest expression of his genius. One must read him in the original or demand a more scholarly presentation than that which is found in separate volumes or in the English editions of his works.

O. W. Long

Williams College

The History of Henry Fielding. By Wilbur L. Cross. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918. Vol. I, pp. [xxiv]+425. Vol. II, pp. 437. Vol. III, pp. 411.

Professor Cross's three-volume life of Fielding is one of the most extensive and distinguished monuments of American scholarship in the domain of literary investigation. The author brings to his work, not only a wide acquaintance with the literary and social background of the early eighteenth century, but also a keen sense of the value of evidence and a genuine enthusiasm for the great realist whose life he presents. In spite of minor inaccuracies and omissions inevitable in so extensive a work, Professor Cross's

study will long remain the standard authority on the life of Fielding. But it is much more than a critical biography; it furnishes a commentary on early eighteenth-century thought which no student of modern literature in Western Europe can afford to disregard. *The History of Henry Fielding* is well printed, is adorned with numerous excellent illustrations, and is supplied with a bibliography and an index.

Caroline Schlegel, Studio sul Romanticismo Tedesco. By BARBARA ALLASON. "Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna." Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1919. Pp. 202.

Goethe en Angleterre, Étude de littérature comparée. By JEAN-MARIE CARRÉ. Paris: Plon-Nourrit & Cie. [1920.] Pp. xviii+300.

Laurence Sterne and Goethe. By W. R. R. PINGER. "University of California Publications in Modern Philology," Vol. X, No. 1. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1920. Pp. 65.

Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn Writer and His Influence on English Hymnody. By THEODORE BROWN HEWITT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918. Pp. xiv+169.

The first of the volumes here enumerated deals with one of the most significant of the minor figures connected with the Romantic Movement in Germany. Although intimately associated with men who thought only of literary production, Caroline Schlegel (1763–1809) cared little for fame; yet she may in a sense be called the Muse of German Romanticism. "Tra i suoi contemporanei ella fu famosa per l'intensa spiritualità, per la virtù ch'ella ebbe in grado eccellente di animare e suscitare negli altri l'energia artistica; tra i posteri vive in grazia di un epistolario." In *Caroline Schlegel* Barbara Allason covers in greater detail the ground traversed years ago by Haym in "Ein deutsches Frauenleben aus der Zeit unserer Litteraturblüthe" (*Preuss. Jahrb.*, Vol. XXVIII). With many incidental comments and illustrative quotations the author reviews Caroline's association with the Jena group and other Romanticists, her activities in connection with the *Athenaeum*, and her theories of art, philosophy, and religion. Of especial interest to students of Comparative Literature are the chapter on "Shakespeare" and a portion of the Appendix devoted to Caroline's influence upon A. W. Schlegel in connection with *Romeo and Juliet*.

In *Goethe en Angleterre* Jean-Marie Carré traces the popularity and influence of Goethe's works in England from the first translation of *Werther* (1779) to Lewes' *Life* (1855). Without losing sight of the larger and more significant aspects of the subject in the mass of details presented, the author interprets in a highly illuminating fashion the changing attitude toward Goethe's writings as they successively came within the ken of the English public, and seeks to determine his influence upon Lewis, Scott, Taylor,

Robinson, Carlyle, Bulwer Lytton, Thackeray, Browning, and other English writers. The history of Wertherism in England, so keenly analyzed by Professor Carré, has been studied from special angles by Professor O. W. Long in *Modern Philology*, Volume XIV. Professor Carré's book includes only a few specific references to original sources, most of the bibliographical material being included in a separate volume entitled *Bibliographie critique et analytique de "Goethe en Angleterre"* (Paris, 1920). The dissertation is a model of scholarly method in the field of Comparative Literature.

Laurence Sterne and Goethe is the product of investigations begun by the late Professor W. R. R. Pinger, of the University of California, and supplemented by Professor L. M. Price, whose excellent bibliography and survey of English-German literary influences has attracted such favorable notice. The brochure is divided into three parts. The first and last summarize and interpret the evidence presented in Part II, in which are quoted in chronological order Goethe's references to Sterne from 1772 to 1831. Goethe's observations on sentimentality, which constitute the most interesting portion of Professor Pinger's collectanea, form a valuable commentary on one phase of English influence upon German literature.

In his dissertation on Paul Gerhardt Professor T. B. Hewitt discusses the work of a seventeenth-century German hymnologist and attempts to measure his influence upon writers of sacred song in England and America. Gerhardt's work embodies the best traditions of the earlier German sacred lyric. His influence upon English hymnology, mostly in the form of translations and adaptations, begins early in the eighteenth and reaches its culmination late in the nineteenth century. Of the 132 hymns from his pen, 84 were translated or adapted into English, and the writings of numerous English hymnologists, notably Charles Wesley, furnish other evidence of the popularity of Gerhardt in England. Professor Hewitt's dissertation is accompanied by a bibliography, by six tables of metrical and other devices used by Gerhardt, and by several indexes.

From Ritual to Romance. By JESSIE L. WESTON. Cambridge: The University Press, 1920. Pp. vii+202.

Traces of Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore. By ALBERT WILLIAM ARON. "University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature," No. 9. Madison, 1920. Pp. 77.

Leuvensche Bijdragen op het Gebied van de Germaansche Philologie en in 't bijzonder van de Nederlandsche Dialectkunde. XII[e] Jaargang. Eerste Aflevering. 1914.

Miss Weston's *From Ritual to Romance* is a forward step toward the final solution of the Grail problem in that it adds to the already extensive list of parallels between the Grail story and vegetation rites, but it does not solve that problem. In spite of her long experience in scientific literary

research, the author, it is to be feared, has not yet quite mastered the difference between a pleasantly written essay and a closely knit scholarly dissertation. Miss Weston's hypothesis, though not new, is sound, but when she attempts to use her data for purposes of argument, she frequently skates on ice so thin that I hesitate to follow her.

In No. 9 of the "University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature" Dr. Aron collects and discusses numerous passages in Germanic hero-legend which he regards as traces of matriarchy. Some of the instances cited are undoubtedly open to question, but in general the brochure is a valuable contribution to the study of the influence of custom upon literature.

The first part of the *Leuvensche Bijdragen* for 1914 contains the last two (the fourth and fifth) chapters of Dr. L. Simons' study of "Waltharius en de Walthersage." The author here deals with the important subject of sources and origins, the former chapters having treated successively of textual matters, of "Waltharius als kunstwerk," and of "De dichter en de totstandkoming van Waltharius." Both Dr. Aron's and Dr. Simon's works are accompanied by bibliographies.

Revue de littérature comparée. Dirigée par F. BALDENSPERGER [et] P. HAZARD. Première Année. No. 1, Janvier-Mars, 1921. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion. Pp. 184.

Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII^e^ siècle. By GUSTAVE COHEN. "Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée." Paris: Librairie Ancienne Édouard Champion, 1920. Pp. 756.

Modern Philology welcomes into the field of literary investigation *Revue de littérature comparée* and wishes for it a long and successful career The first number, which has just appeared, contains four articles on topic connected with Comparative Literature. Especially noteworthy is a discussion of "Littérature comparée: le mot et la chose," by M. Baldensperger, one of the directors of the journal. Other important features are the reviews, a classified bibliography of current publications, and a "Chronique" somewhat similar to that familiar to all readers of *Romania.* Professor Cohen's *Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII^e^ siècle* is the first of a series of independent studies designed to complete the effort of the *Revue* to cover the field of Comparative Literature. It treats exhaustively of "Régiments français au service des États," of "Professeurs et étudiants français a l'Université de Leyde (1575 à 1648)," and of "La Philosophie indépendante (René Descartes en Hollande)."

T. P. CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Linguistic Studies in Germanic

Edited by FRANCIS A. WOOD

Professor of Germanic Philology, in the University of Chicago

Volumes Published

I. *The Semantic Development of Words for Eating and Drinking in Germanic.* By Henry Otto Schwabe, Ph.D. xii+110 pages, royal 8vo, paper. 75 cents, postpaid 85 cents.

II. *Parts of the Body in Older Germanic and Scandinavian.* By Torild W. Arnoldson. xii+218 pages, royal 8vo, paper, $1.25, postpaid $1.40.

III. *English Words with Native Roots and with Greek, Latin, or Romance Suffixes.* By George Nicholson. iv+55 pages, royal 8vo, paper. 50 cents, postpaid 53 cents.

IV. *The Semantic Development of Words for "Walk, Run" in the Germanic Languages.* By Roscoe Myrl Ihrig, Ph.D. vii+168 pages, royal 8vo, paper. 75 cents, postpaid 85 cents.

V. *The Parts of the Body in Later Germanic.* By W. D. Baskett. ix+139 pages, royal 8vo, paper. 75 cents, postpaid 85 cents.

In Preparation

Words for "Mental Aberration" in Germanic. By Hartie Emil Zabel.

AS ONLY A SMALL EDITION WILL BE ISSUED OF EACH OF THESE STUDIES, IT IS HOPED THAT ORDERS WILL BE SENT AT ONCE, AND ALSO CONTINUATION ORDERS FOR THE SERIES.

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago - - - - Illinois

POSITIONS OF ALL KINDS

Never was the demand so great for qualified teachers and specialists. For ten years we have given our time and energy to this work. Write for our *free* literature. State qualifications briefly.

Co-operative Instructors' Association
Marion - - - Indiana

A Manual for Writers

By JOHN M. MANLY

Head of the Department of English of the University of Chicago

and JOHN A. POWELL

A book designed to aid authors and all others who are concerned with the writing of English. It treats in a clear and convenient way the matters of grammar, spelling, and general form about which writers need to be informed, and gives full directions on the preparation of "copy" for the printer and the correcting of proof. The chapter on letter-writing is unique and gives just the help that is constantly wanted and that is not found in other manuals.

viii+226 pages, 12mo, cloth; $1.50 net, postpaid $1.65

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago - - - - Illinois

The Modern Study of Literature

By RICHARD GREEN MOULTON

Head of the Department of General Literature in the University of Chicago

This volume is attracting wide attention from students of literature. It is written by a life-long student and interpreter of literature, and is designed as an introduction to literary theory and interpretation. The general purpose of the work is to present, alike to the teacher and to the cultured reader, the intrinsic study of literature as inspired by modern ideas and inductive science.

It treats, successively, Literary Morphology and Literary Evolution; Literary Criticism, the traditional confusion and modern reconstruction of criticism, and the conception of literature as at once a Mode of Philosophy and a Mode of Art. While abstract discussion is not avoided where it is necessary, the general plan of the work is to elucidate the philosophy of literature in application to familiar literature masterpieces.

xii+530 pages, 12mo, cloth; $2.75, postpaid $2.90

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO - - - - - - ILLINOIS

NEW BOOKS

The "University of Chicago Italian Series" edited by ERNEST H. WILKINS, Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Chicago. This series is to consist of a grammar, a reader, and editions of modern Italian novels, plays, and other works. There have already been published

A First Italian Book by ERNEST HATCH WILKINS is along distinctively new lines, carefully adapted to the particular needs of the American student. $1.50, postpaid $1.65.

The second volume in the series, Giacosa's *Tristi Amori*, edited by RUDOLPH ALTROCCHI and BENJAMIN M. WOODBRIDGE, has a very full and interesting introduction by Stanley Astredo Smith, in which the opinion is expressed that the present play is Giacosa's masterpiece. $1.50, postpaid $1.60.

L'Italia, by ERNEST H. WILKINS and ANTONIO MARINONI. A very simple Italian reader, consisting of short sketches written by the editors, dealing with Italian history and Italian life. Illustrated. $1.50, postpaid $1.60.

Farina's *Fra le corde d'un contrabasso*, edited with Notes and Vocabulary by ELSIE SCHOBINGER and ETHEL PRESTON $1.40, postpaid $1.50.

The Press and Politics in Japan. By KISABURŌ KAWABÉ. $2.00, postpaid $2.15. The purpose of this book is to show the influence of the press upon the political life of Japan. It is an orderly arrangement of the significant facts of a rapidly developing civilization and furnishes the student of ancient and modern Japan with an abundance of information regarding the rapid transformation which has taken place since 1868. It will therefore be interesting reading, not only to the students of sociology, but also to those who are interested in journalism, politics, and history.

Principles of Accounting. By ALBERT C. HODGE and JAMES O. MCKINSEY, the School of Commerce and Administration, the University of Chicago. $3.00, postpaid $3.15. This book fills the special need of a beginning text in accounting to prepare the student for business. The discussion of principles of accounting is primarily in terms of the function of accounting as an administrative aid to the business manager. Consideration is given to the forms of reports and records and the classification of accounts.

Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1920. $3.50, postpaid $3.65. The publications of this organization are written by specialists, men and women who are authorities in their various branches of social improvement. They discuss problems and practical methods, and seek to disseminate information helpful to the social worker.

Elementary Russian Grammar. By E. PROKOSCH, Bryn Mawr College. $2.25, postpaid $2.40. Employs the direct method, the main features of which are an exposition of Russian pronunciation on a phonetic basis, the inductive presentation of grammatical principles, and the oral approach to an elementary vocabulary through object teaching. The author aims at the development of a consciously correct pronunciation, an intuitive feeling for grammatical structure, and an endeavor to read Russian literature without the crutch of translation.

The Revelation of John. Is the Book of Revelation a Mystery to You? By SHIRLEY J. CASE, Professor of Early Church History and New Testament, the University of Chicago. $2.75, postpaid $2.90. This is a popular presentation of the subject and not a technical commentary. The author tells why and when the book was written.

The Geography of the Ozark Highland of Missouri. By CARL ORTWIN SAUER, the University of Michigan. $3.00, postpaid $3.15. The purpose of such a study is twofold: to furnish an adequate explanation of the conditions of life in a given area, and to contribute proved statements which will aid in working out fundamental principles. A valuable feature of the volume is the forty-four figures in the text and twenty-six plates.

A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek. By ERNEST D. BURTON and EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. $3.00, postpaid $3.15. The purpose of this volume is to facilitate that careful comparison of the several gospels, sentence by sentence, even word by word, which is the first condition of success in the study of the mutual relation of the gospels, and an indispensable basis for advanced study of their contents.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois

PB
1
M7
v.18

Modern philology

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY